The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, APRIL 13, 1893.

The Week.

It is hardly too much to say that President Cleveland had no more important appointment to make than that of Commissioner of Pensions. Originally a mere subordinate of the Secretary of the Interior, who controlled the expenditure of but a small portion of the Government's revenues, the head of this Bureau has come to have in his hands the distribution of more than $150,000,000 a year, with a prospect that the outgo from his office may reach the enormous total of $200,000,000 annually before the steady and rapid increase is checked. The most reckless profligacy has long characterized the action of Congress in voting money for this branch of the Government service, and equal recklessness has characterized the distribution of the money by the Bureau. The result has been the building up of a pension roll which is a disgrace to the nation. What was needed was the selection of a man of high character, judicial training, and established reputation, who was a Union soldier himself, and who could be trusted to administer the office with due regard to the interests both of his deserving comrades in the army and of the taxpayers of the nation. Such a man seems to have been secured in the choice for the Commissionership of Judge William Lochren of Minnesota, a brilliant soldier during the civil war, and since then a distinguished judge in his own State. While a Democrat in his sympathies, he is so little of a partisan that he was originally appointed to the bench by a Republican Governor and elected by a Republican district, and he is so highly esteemed by his fellow-citizens that the State Legislature, which has a Republican majority, recently passed by a unanimous vote a resolution declaring that he was eminently well qualified for the office of Pension Commissioner, and that his appointment would receive the approbation of the country at large.

Nobody questions the need of a radical overhauling of pension methods, yet how difficult the work is going to be, how few are the convenient and effective points of attack, may be seen from the discussion of the question in the current *North American*. All of the writers admit the urgency of reform, but all are barren of actual suggestions of the way to go about it. The Chairman of the House Committee on Pensions thinks that something might be gained by a stricter interpretation of the Disability Act of 1890, and by a return to the system of biennial medical examinations, and advocates taking the whole system out of politics by transferring it to the War Department and putting it under the care of an officer of the army. A past-commander of the Grand Army of the Republic shows how the spirit of self-help and brotherly charity which marked the first years of that organization has passed into the blind appeal to the Government. He thinks, however, that "the scythe of the great reaper" will soon come to the relief of the taxpayer. "A little patience and the account will be closed." This is ludicrous enough in view of the facts. Father Time's swath has been getting wider and wider, not among the pensioners, but in the Treasury, as the years have gone by.

The Post-office Department, so far from concealing information about its doings, as was threatened one day last week, is now more frank and explicit than ever. The daily reports of appointments now made include an analysis of the total, which shows how many are to fill vacancies caused by resignation or death, and how many of the removals are of incumbents who had served four years or more. Thus on Monday 119 fourth-class postmasters were appointed, of whom 99 were to fill vacancies, while seventeen of the twenty removed had served four years or more. A statement has been given out which shows that during the month beginning with March 4 the appointments of fourth-class postmasters numbered 878, of which 508 were to fill vacancies caused by resignation or death, and 370 in place of men removed, 90 of whom had served four years or more. In the first month of the Harrison Administration the appointments to fill vacancies were almost exactly the same—503; but the removals were 825, or more than twice as many.

Senator Gorman got together in Washington last week "sixty active Democrats" from among the oilers and stokers of his Maryland Machine, and poured a tale of woe into their sympathetic ears. They were men after his own heart, he assured them, whom it was his purpose to serve; and as far as he had anything to do with the offices, "none others need apply." But "a condition [not a theory] confronts us in the matter of appointments." Horrible to relate, "many suggestions that have been made to the appointing power have been ignored." What effect this had upon the active Democrats does not appear, but from what we know of them it is safe to infer that the Senator's announcement struck them like an abrogation of all the laws of nature. As he pointed out, under the ordinary workings of nature and Providence, "the offices should go to our friends." But by some diabolical interference, some monstrous perversion of "the appointing power," the thing that should be was not. Hence these tears. But Mr. Gorman will get no sympathy from a heartless public. In fact, the open exhibition of his grief will be the signal for rejoicing among those who wish the Administration well. He was the most malign influence that beset Mr. Cleveland during his first term, and this early display of his nose out of joint is among the cheering auguries of better things for the four years to come. He and Hill and Murphy will, in truth, make an excellent set of signals by which to judge of the political weather: things must be going fairly well when they despond.

What has become of that tremendous enthusiasm for the annexation of Hawaii which two months ago was inundating the country? Commissioner Blount's arrival at the Islands is telegraphed, with the consequent depression of the annexationists and joy of the royalists, but none of the editors who were so impassioned about the "key of the Pacific" in February now stops to do as much as shed a silent and bitter tear at the spectacle. Perhaps they see how difficult it will be to keep up the required tension for the length of time Mr. Blount means to spend in his inquiries. He actually plans to visit all the islands and employ several weeks in finding out the real sentiments of the people. It was evidently a great mistake to send a man of such plodding methods, when there were available as commissioners men of lightning-like minds, such as that of the ex-officer of the navy who told a reporter that the "nine hours" he spent in Honolulu thoroughly convinced him that the Hawaiians to a man were in favor of annexation.

A letter from Honolulu to the *Evening Post* only confirms the impression which almost all the later news gives, that the sentiment of the native Hawaiians is overwhelmingly against annexation to the United States. There seems to be no mistaking the genuineness of the relief which they experienced on learning that they were not to lose their country, and the unexampled outpouring of the natives, and the signs of popular rejoicing, are just such things as we should expect among men who felt that their political independence had escaped a great peril. President Cleveland's summary withdrawal of the treaty is thus fully justified. It is interesting to note the "slight seismic disturbances," as the *Tribune's* correspondent elegantly terms them, among the annexationists themselves. They are fast getting into trouble on their own account, and the Provisional Government itself is coming in for sharp criticism. Great offence is given, in particular, by the continued payment of a salary to the Queen and Princess Kaiulani, at

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the rate of $25,000 a year. The noble republicans who got up the revolution know of many deserving fellows who could make use of that money, and are "at a loss" to explain its payment to an overthrown ruler. But the *Tribune* correspondent significantly writes:

"I have learned that it is due to the diplomacy of the Harrison Administration, which advised President Dole that so much sympathy for the Queen had been raised in the United States by the refusal of the Thurston embassy to let her envoy go to America in the *Claudine*, and by the segregation of the crown lands, that it would involve the annexation issue in extreme peril if further humiliations should be put upon the deposed sovereign."

The immediate collapse of the strike at the World's Fair grounds is a thing good both in itself and in the manner of it. The directors have escaped the peril of a delayed opening of the Exposition and the greater peril of knuckling down to labor tyranny. If they had given in to the demand that all non-union men must be at once discharged, they would have furnished the world quite the most striking exhibition of the fruits of our civilization to be seen at Chicago. Men who rail at laws and judges that would make "serfs" of workingmen and "czars" of employers, ought to explain who are the serfs and czars in the case of a labor union denying to thousands of laboring men the right to work for their daily bread. The incident has closed happily, but not without suggesting the real beauties of State employment. The Chicago Fair is a semi-national business, and the readiness of the labor agitators to bring political pressure to bear on the managers indicates pretty ominously what would be the course of things in a great established State industry. We should see, in fact, what was seen in Paris just before the fall of the Ribot Ministry. There was a strike in the national match-factories, and various demands were made on the Government relating to wages and superintendence They were at first roundly refused, but the strike spread, the strikers scurried around and got deputies and other mighty men in politics to wait upon the Ministry and threaten loss of votes on critical divisions, and finally the Government took fright and made an unconditional surrender. Two days later the Ministry fell, in spite of the few extra votes it had from the Radicals.

In 1890 Congress passed "An Act to Protect Trade and Commerce against Unlawful Restraints and Monopolies," which provided that "every contract or combination in the form of Trust or otherwise in restraint of trade or commerce among the several States or with foreign nations is hereby declared to be illegal" and punishable by fine and imprisonment. Provision was made for an injunction on behalf of the United States. In November last, trade and commerce and comfortable living in New Orleans were brought to a dead standstill by the concerted action of the labor unions, represented by the officers of their Amalgamated Council. James E. Porter, the colored member of the Council, is reported to have said, and the report has not been denied: "We propose to win by peace if we can, but if we are pushed to the wall, force will be employed." For several days the whole city was without means of transportation, without even hearses for the burial of the dead, and without gas or electric lights. In this emergency, Judge William Wirt Howe, the counsel for the Board of Trade, suggested that this action of organized labor was an unlawful restraint directed against trade and commerce by an unlawful combination. The United States Attorney, Mr. Earhart, was appealed to, and, with the permission of the Department of Justice, he filed a bill on behalf of the Government in the United States Circuit Court against the Amalgamated Council and all the societies behind it, including the Society of Musicians which had "tied up" the French opera. The service of process was immediately followed by a cessation of the strike, without, however, an abandonment of the combination and its perpetual menace.

Judge Billings of the Circuit Court has recently rendered his decision in the case—a decision which must, in the estimation of labor, mark as a bungler or an enemy every man in Congress who voted for the bill. It was decided substantially (1) that the cessation of the strike and of active violence was of no avail so long as the combination existed and the right to restrain trade was not disclaimed; (2) that the statute of Congress interdicted combinations of labor as well as of capital; (3) that the defendants' general denials did not rebut the case; (4) that the proofs of the Government fully sustained the charges of combination and violence and a complete paralysis of inter-State and international commerce in New Orleans; (5) that the defendant societies, while innocent and lawful in their origin, had no more right to make unlawful combinations than had individuals of equally worthy character; (6) that a combination to secure the employment of none but Union men by concerted acts of intimidation and violence, when directed against inter-State and international commerce, is an unlawful restraint of trade, against which the statute is aimed. It marks a curious continuity in social history that the one decision cited by the Court was that of Chief Justice Savage (The People vs. Fisher, 14 Wendell, 1), rendered half a century ago, in which it was set forth that a mechanic "may say that he will not make coarse boots for less than one dollar per pair, but he has no right to say that no other mechanic shall make them for less."

The April elections for municipal officers, held in scores of places all over the State of Kansas, have given the people the first chance to express their opinion upon the performances of the past winter, and they have everywhere availed themselves of it. The Populists put forward their candidates in every case, and did their utmost to win. The vote was unusually heavy, for the women, who have for several years enjoyed the right to vote in municipal elections, availed themselves of it far more generally than ever before, their registration being half as large as that of the men in Leavenworth and Wichita, and two-thirds as large in Topeka. The weather seems to have been favorable throughout the State, and both sexes turned out to the polls in force. Attempts were generally made by the politicians in both parties to continue the fusion between the Democrats and the Populists, but many of the Democrats refused longer to be bound by it, and voted for the Republican candidates. In Wichita, Gov. Lewelling's own home, the rebuke of the Populists was most emphatic, the entire Republican city ticket being elected by majorities almost double the highest ever before known, despite the most strenuous efforts on the part of the fusionists to secure an endorsement of his course. In Topeka and a number of other cities, the defeat of the Populists by the Republicans was hardly less pronounced. The prosperity of the State has been threatened by the extraordinary developments of the past winter, and the success of the Populists this month would have frightened away both capital and the most desirable class of inhabitants. But the material aspect of the case was the least important. The deliberate endorsement of Populist principles and methods would have meant that the people of a great commonwealth were unfit for self-government.

The difficulties of serving as chaplain of a legislative body appear to be on the increase. We commented some weeks ago upon the dissatisfaction caused in both Kansas and Nebraska the past winter by the display of partisanship in the prayers of the clergymen employed. There has been even more serious trouble in Texas. A bill was recently defeated in the House of Representatives which proposed to make an appropriation from the State Treasury for the establishment of a home for fallen women. Next day the chaplain besought the Deity to "open the eyes of those who have allowed the love of money to be balanced against virtue, that they may see that purity is above rubies, and that in their hands is placed the power to save those against whom the false standard of society has closed the churches and all avenues of reformation." One of the members who had voted against the bill offered a resolution reciting that "the prayer which appears in the House journals this morning is an unjust and unwarrantable reflection on certain members," and ordering that the portion above quoted be ex-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

punged from the journals. Another member supported the motion in a vigorous speech, declaring the prayer "an insult to the members," and an "attempt of the chaplain to dictate to the House." But the chaplain had his defenders also, one of whom insisted that he had not gone far enough; that "without prayer and much prayer you are gone for ever"; and that "there are members criticising this prayer who are steeped in vice and folly and need prayer." The clergyman himself was given the floor, and explained that he had no individual member in mind, and that they were "all patriotic, honest, and honorable gentlemen"—in short, that the objectionable passage was uttered in a Pickwickian sense. Thereupon the resolution was rejected and the matter was dropped. The incident shows very clearly what a farce the chaplain's prayer has become, and should hasten the day of its abolition.

The appointment of a new Forest Commission on Monday by Governor Flower, under the recently enacted law in relation to the Forest Preserve and Adirondack Park, marks the completion of the new system of forest preservation instituted in this State on the recommendation of the Governor. The new law is divided into two parts—the first covering the subject of the Forest Preserve and the second that of the Adirondack Park. The first sections make very minute and stringent provisions for the care of the Forest Preserve, especially as regards the prevention and extension of forest fires, and of trespasses upon the Preserve, and the cutting of trees and timber. The Adirondack Park, which includes the islands in Lake George, is to be "for ever reserved, maintained, and cared for as ground open for the free use of all the people for their health and pleasure, and as forest lands necessary to the preservation of the head-waters of the chief rivers of the State and a future timber supply." The Forest Commission has very extensive powers over this park, and among other things is allowed to lease, for a term not longer than five years, parcels of not more than five acres to any one person for the erection of camps. All the employees of the Commission are to have the powers conferred by law upon game protectors, and the Commission may provide for the enforcement of the game law within the park by means other than those laid down in the statute. If the Governor has made a wise selection of Commissioners, this law ought to protect the forest lands of the State effectually from further depredations.

The *Manufacturer* of Philadelphia sees an objection to the admission of Venezuelan coffee free of duty, because in that case Venezuela would obtain for nothing a favor for which Brazil pays a price. This would be alarming if only Venezuelan and Brazilian interests were to be considered. But since American interests are involved, we cannot afford to take the exclusively foreign view which the *Manufacturer* recommends. The consumers of coffee in the United States have some rights. There is neither reason nor sense in compelling our own people to pay $5,000,000 a year in a roundabout way as a tax on coffee, only a portion of which goes into the public treasury, in order to reconcile the ideas of McKinley with those of Blaine. The reciprocity dodge in the McKinley bill had no basis other than this. It served its purpose of carrying the Republican party through an election, but did not win the race. We see no reason why the public should pay the coffee tax any longer, or why the Republicans should desire it any longer. The protectionists have told us often enough that our laws are made for Americans, not for foreigners. Why, then, should the organ of the Manufacturers' Club be so solicitous for the interests of Brazil at the expense of the consumers of coffee in the United States?

The resolution passed by the British House of Commons affirming the principle of payment of members has made, coming as it does in company with the Parish Councils and other democratic measures, a good deal of sensation. The Tories hardly venture to oppose it squarely. They take a middle ground, and say, Let any constituency which chooses to pay its member do so by taxing itself for the purpose; but why tax the whole country in order to pay members who do not wish to be paid—a category which probably contains a majority of the present House? When members were paid, as was the case before the Revolution of 1688, this is the way in which it was done: Any constituency that pleased paid its members, and any member who pleased served without pay. To this the Liberals make answer that it would never do to have two classes of members, the paid and the unpaid, as this would be sure to put the former in a position of inferiority, and make them the butt of sneers, as the Irish members are actually at present, because they take pay from their constituents or from "the Parliamentary fund," in order to enable them to stay in London. But there is no doubt that the change derives its most powerful support from its democratic character. The argument in its favor which has most force is the democratic argument, that it will enable a number of poor men, especially representatives of Labor, to go into Parliament who now cannot afford it. Mr. Burt, one of the Labor members now in the House, made a powerful speech in its favor from this point of view, describing the insults to which he himself was exposed in the shape of attempts to bribe him, made in the belief that he must, because he is poor, be very hard up and therefore likely to yield easily. He laid much stress, as did others in the debate, on the fact that the Parliament which contained Hampden and Pym was a paid Parliament, and therefore payment could not be a very bad thing.

But the world outside Parliament has so changed since then that neither Hampden nor Pym would know it if he came back. It was impossible in England of that day for any but leading men—that is, local notables—to go to Parliament. Parliament, therefore, pay or no pay, was sure to contain the flower of the nation as regards character and capacity. The most marked political phenomenon of our day, on the other hand, is the eagerness of nobodies to get into the Legislature merely to make a living or to get a chance of perquisites. This is the root-evil of modern politics in all democratic countries. Its growth has unquestionably been retarded in England by the non-payment of members. That is, the English House of Commons owes part of its purity to the fact that few or none can sit in it who have not means of support through accumulations or some remunerative profession or calling. As the world goes, the best politicians are, and must always be, men who do not get a living out of politics. How long this class will hold its own in England after a seat in the House carries a salary with it, remains to be seen. To be sure, it is more logical and symmetrical to pay legislators, like other public officers, but the world does not live by logic any more than by bread alone.

A writer in a late number of the *Fortnightly* discussed the question of the importance of Gibraltar to England, and came to the conclusion that, except as against Spain in the almost impossible event of war, the fortress was of slight strategic value. He thought its further retention by Great Britain was only a piece of sentimentalism, like keeping Nelson's *Victory* still on exhibition. To Spain, however, Gibraltar would be of positive as well as sentimental value, and he thought she would be willing to pay well for its cession. He suggested that the Spanish Government be approached on the subject, to see if it would exchange some of the Spanish possessions in Africa for the famous fortress. Meanwhile the Spanish press has taken the matter up. Castelar's organ says that the Spaniards would have to lose all their shrewdness at a bargain before they would bid anything for a piece of property which the would-be seller had set out by declaring was worth nothing to himself. In a more truculent tone the leading Conservative organ declared that not a single Spaniard would ever consent to such an ignominious exchange. It added: "There may be some thought in this country that Gibraltar will be restored to us, or that we will win it back for ourselves by God's grace, but there is absolutely no thought of giving up any territory which we now possess."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE BETTER AND THE BUMMER ELEMENT.

THE defeat of "the better element" in Chicago by the bummer and semi-criminal element under Mr. Carter Harrison—and in the Exposition year, too—has naturally excited much attention in this city. Some solve the problem by throwing doubt on the existence of a "better element" in Chicago, and others by attributing Harrison's victory to the absence of "organization" on the part of his opponents. The inquiry is a very interesting one for us, because the political condition of Chicago so strongly resembles that of New York. That there exists a "better element" in Chicago there is no question. It is to be found in the vote of about 100,000 against Harrison. It exists here and in every city in the Union, but somehow it is not ordinarily strong enough to carry municipal elections except by a special effort known as a "popular uprising," which is, however, never available except when the misconduct of the bummer and semi-criminal element has become extremely bad. The Government of Russia has been described as "despotism tempered by assassination." In like manner the government of large cities in America may be termed "bummer government tempered by uprisings." Nevertheless, we believe that both in Chicago and New York the Better Element is really in a majority, and could, if it chose, retain the government of the municipality permanently in its hands. This is certainly true of New York, for the Bummer Element here has never yet polled a majority of the registered vote. Take, by way of illustration, the important election of 1888, at which Tammany got possession of the city. Tammany polled in that year 114,000 out of a total registered vote of 286,000. In 1890 it polled 116,000, or only 2,000 more, which may be called the natural increase of the Bummer Element. We think it is quite fair to set down as Better Element all voters of every description who do not vote the Tammany ticket. This Better Element, then, in 1888 registered 172,000 votes; in 1890, after two years' experience of Bummer rule, 129,000 votes. If the full registered vote in either of these two years had been cast against Tammany, Tammany would have been defeated, and the Better Element would now be in possession of the city. But in 1890, after a full trial of the kind of government the new Bummer régime was prepared to furnish, 30,000 of the Better Element stayed away from the polls and allowed Tammany to retain the city. Why did they stay away? Any one who could answer this question would explain the failure of popular government in American cities.

We think it is quite fair to assume that these 30,000 did not abstain because they were ignorant, or corrupt, or foreign-born, for Tammany unquestionably gets hold of all that portion of the New York voting population which comes under any one of these three categories. Nor can we very well ascribe their abstention to lethargy or indifference, because they took the most troublesome step in the exercise of the suffrage by registering. The *Tribune's* explanation of the Chicago defeat, which would also probably be Croker's, that the Better Element does not "organize," does not help us very much. In fact, the "organization" solution has taken the place of that old-fashioned one which ascribed bad municipal government to the failure of the intelligent and respectable classes to attend the primaries, or, as it used to be called, "to attend to their political duties." This lasted until it became a joke. Of course, if the Better Element could vanquish the Bummer Element at the primaries, it could vanquish it at the polls. The fallacy of the expedient was the familiar one of the catching of birds by putting salt on their tails. Organization is undoubtedly necessary to win elections as well as to win battles. But organization in political, as in military, warfare is only the second step towards victory. Before organization can do you any good, you must have troops willing to fight and willing to be organized for the purpose of fighting.

Now, if it were possible to go around among these 30,000 and ask them severally why, having registered, they failed to vote, we should in all probability get a perfectly intelligent answer from nine out of every ten of them. Not one would say that he did not vote because he was not "organized"; that if anybody wanted him to vote, he must "organize" him. Nor probably would any of them say that they preferred Bummer Government to Citizens' Government. Some would have said, doubtless, that they did not think the election of Scott would be enough of an improvement on Grant to make it worth their while to go to the polls to bring it about; others, that Scott was "Grace's man," and they hated Grace; others, that they would never under any circumstances vote for a Democrat; others, that they hated Mugwumps, and that Scott was a Mugwump invention; others, that Scott's nomination was a contrivance for breaking up the Republican party in this city; others, that they wanted to keep Tammany in power as an example of Democratic rule.

Behind all answers, however, would appear the great fundamental fact that they were not deeply impressed with the importance of good city government, or sufficiently convinced of the possibility of attaining it by any political process. It would be found, in truth, that it was to a certain state of mind on the part of a large body of intelligent men that the triumph of the Bummer Element was due—not to want of organization, or to foreign birth, or to ignorance or venality, but to a certain way of looking at things, not more formidable or intractable than the state of mind which for fifty years kept the majority of the people of the North from seeing anything wrong in slavery, or at all events any way of getting rid of slavery good enough to make striving for it worth while.

If this be true—if it be merely a state of mind on the part of decent, rational people that makes Bummer Government in our cities possible—the remedy is the simple one by which all permanent improvements in government have been effected in modern times, viz., the persuasion of people into new ways of looking at the problems of daily life. This, too, cannot be accomplished by essays on municipal government or general denunciation of fraud and wrong. It has to be done by the steady and persistent exposure of the evils of Bummer Government as manifested by offences of commission and omission by particular men in particular places at specified times, and the consequences thereof to the public. All the great changes for the better in the administration of both States and cities have been made in this way. They could be made in no other way as long as human nature remains what it is. All the important steps forward in politics in two hundred and fifty years have been due to exposure of particular abuses as practised by particular persons. We may denounce sin for a thousand years without reducing its volume perceptibly. But catch the sinners and lock them up, or put them to flight, and the effect on the quantity of sin in any particular locality is at once perceptible.

THE POST-OFFICES AND PUBLICITY.

THE Postmaster-General did a very wise thing in deciding to try his fourth-class postmaster case against the newspapers before finally announcing the decision. There is no mistake of which a high officer of the Government can be guilty which has more far-reaching possibilities of evil in it than the manifestation of a disposition to hide the affairs of his branch of the service behind barred doors. Almost any other offence against the assumed liberties of the press is more easily forgiven. The newspapers as a rule are represented in Washington by men who want to be fair. They have no artificial reverence for the dignities of office, however, and they have acquired a habit of thinking that the President, the Cabinet, and all the responsible functionaries are servants of the great American public in fact as well as in name. Sometimes they carry this idea a trifle beyond the legitimate extreme; but generally an officer who meets them half-way in their search for proper information suffers little annoyance from their desire for information which is not proper. A reasonable concession to the popular demand for knowledge as to what the Government is doing, is likely to blunt the edge of any offensive inquisitiveness.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Some of the worst mistakes made eight years ago, when the Democrats assumed the reins of power after a quarter of a century's disuse, were made in attempts at concealment. The Indian Bureau, where nobody except the politicians who had something substantial to give in exchange could get any information to speak of, was about as badly managed for a considerable share of the time from 1885 to 1888 as it ever has been in its history. It is probable that if Commissioner Atkins's record could be thoroughly overhauled, he would himself come out unsmirched; but the unfortunate atmosphere of secretiveness which pervaded the office, and which was doubtless due in a great measure to the fact that the head of it knew almost nothing of its affairs, gave every one who had business there a suspicion of the moral quality of its management. The proportion of newspaper correspondents in Washington who were willing to believe that everything was right in quarters where they were denied the privilege of personal scrutiny was very small indeed. Under the administration of Gen. Morgan, on the contrary, even the representatives of newspapers politically hostile, while they might criticise the policy and methods of the Commissioner, were ready for the most part to swear to the honesty of his motives and the uprightness of his conduct, because he never turned away an inquirer in good faith. The letter-books, the accounts, all the papers of the office, were open to the inspection of any person who came there, properly accredited, to get information for the public, or to investigate a charge of wrongdoing.

A similar change came over the Civil Service Commission in 1889, when Messrs. Roosevelt and Thompson were appointed by President Harrison to membership. There was nothing in their way of doing business to conceal, therefore they concealed nothing. They invited the closest scrutiny of their manner of conducting business, with the result that they made converts to the merit system on every hand of public men and journalists who for the first time had a chance to see for themselves how the machinery worked, and who enjoyed the novelty of being invited to criticise and ask questions to their heart's content.

It is such examples, chosen at random from among many, which give force to the general rule that light and air hurt no one who does not deserve to be hurt. The present Cleveland Administration will be judged by comparison with its latest predecessor more sharply than the former Cleveland Administration was; and one of the first things an intelligent observer will note in preparing his standards is that the good men whom President Harrison drew around him may be distinguished from the bad and the indifferent, in looking back now on the four years just ended, by the fact that they who had nothing to be ashamed of walked and worked in the broadest sunshine.

To apply the moral to the case of the Post-office Department, the poorest apology for a man whom Mr. Harrison invited into his council chamber was John Wanamaker. He was also the most secretive. When he was dealing with an ordinary visitor in search of information which he did not care to give, his method was to draw the inquirer off the main question and fall to talking about the greatness of the Wanamaker shop in Philadelphia and the dimensions of its business in the course of a year. When the Civil Service Reform League Committee to investigate the operations of the departments came to him, however, with a polite request for permission to look through the records and see how many changes had been made in the fourth-class offices within a certain period, he could not make such tactics work, and therefore fell back upon an absolute refusal. There was no reason in the world for his denying them the right to look over the books, for they were prepared to do so without interfering with the business of the Department, and wholly at their private expense; but he treated the Government records as his own property, and the Committee had to obtain their information from other sources. It would have been very unfortunate if Postmaster-General Bissell had been misled into following the bad example of his predecessor. If the present Administration will bear comparison with the Harrison Administration, what would it have to fear from having all the facts come out, even if in some quarters an unfair use were made of them? If the multitude of changes made is right, why make any fuss about letting the whole world know how the changes are going on? If all this is wrong, nothing would be gained by closing the door upon it and leaving the public to frame its own conjectures. On the contrary, the public would be almost certain to conclude that the facts are worse than they really are.

THE IRON TRADE.

STATISTICS gathered by the trade journals show great changes in the relative output of pig-iron on the part of England and the United States. In 1882 Great Britain produced 4,000,000 tons of pig iron more than this country, that year covering her largest output; but in 1892 the United States made 2,500,000 tons more than Great Britain, that country's production having declined while ours increased to over 9,000,000 tons per annum. This heavy increase has been accompanied by such low prices that none but a furnace exceptionally favored has made any money. Nevertheless it is undeniable that great advances have been made in all branches of manufacture in the effort to reduce cost. Thus, during the decade just mentioned, the annual production of pig-iron has doubled, while the number of active blast furnaces has declined one-fifth. Not long ago a furnace producing 50 tons or so of pig-iron daily was thought to be doing well, but now a production of 200 tons per day is not considered remarkable.

Not only has the average capacity of blast furnaces changed very much, but the other elements in the problem of iron and steel manufacture are also different. To establish an iron centre is not now so simple a matter. Other industries more or less directly connected with the production of pig-iron or with the manufacture of steel naturally and necessarily group themselves around the common centre, and in process of time come under a common management, thus greatly increasing the common efficiency, and at the same time rendering the whole plant so formidable as to defy a competitor perhaps better situated as to ore or coal. The collapse of a number of real-estate booms has clearly demonstrated that the growth of a "city" is not certain because a blast furnace has been built in the neighborhood. A hint as to this fact could have been drawn from the history of many older furnaces, which have not collected around them any settlements of consequence. Pittsburgh is at a distance from the ore-beds, and Chicago is not near the coal-fields. It will not do in these days of large output and low prices to count too confidently upon success because of nearness to particular mines. Then, again, the iron trade must turn towards specializing. Advances in knowledge of chemistry and in the demand for special kinds of iron composition compel the ironmaster to establish his plant where he can most readily avail himself of different kinds of material. Local iron-ore mines have thus lost their advantage. Lastly, the market must be considered. With the development of transportation and the art of adjusting railway rates to trade conditions, iron plants compete though widely separated. Yet the available markets for different qualities of metal must be studied as never before.

The iron ores of Lake Superior furnish the principal material for the Northern furnaces. It was at first supposed that the discovery of easily mined ores in the Mesabi region would much reduce the selling price for all the ranges, but further reflection shows another side to the question. Estimates of the growth of iron production in the United States made by Mr. A. S. Hewitt and others seem likely to be exceeded. The proportion of Bessemer pig-iron is now about 42 per cent. of the total. The estimates of output for 1900 are put at 15,000,000 tons, of which 6,300,000 tons will be Bessemer iron, requiring 10,500,000 tons of 60 per cent. ore annually, of which the Lake Superior mines should furnish 4,700,000. These few hypothetical figures show that the amounts of Bessemer ore now in sight in the Lake Superior ranges are to feel a serious drain before many years are over, and that

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the prospective value of this ore is great enough to stop any important decline in present prices because of the Mesabi discovery; for the time seems approaching when lean ores now neglected will have to be utilized if we are to have the expected great annual output of pig-iron in the next century. In view of such broad facts, how petty becomes the tariff policy of the United States in putting a duty upon Cuban ore. Recent investigation shows that the Cuban output will not exceed a million tons a year. The expert's report upon them says: "Cuban ores can never come into competition with Lake Superior ores in their natural markets west of the Alleghanies. It is neither natural, reasonable, nor equitable that the seaboard furnaces should depend upon Lake Superior for supplies. If that were the case, the whole steel and iron industries of the seaboard would, in the course of a few years, become extinguished. Cuba pertains naturally to the North American Continent, and Cuban ores ought to be considered as domestic and not as foreign ores." Exports of iron goods may in a few years become as necessary for us as now are exports of wheat and cotton, and if so the lowest cost of production is an essential factor.

Mr. John Birkinbine, President of the American Institute of Mining Engineers and an authority on the iron problem, said in a recent article in the *Engineering Magazine:* "Each year shows an increase in the average percentage of iron in the ore mixtures used in American blast furnaces, and longer distances covered by the rich ores in reaching points of consumption. It is probable that future advances may be in the direction of conveying fuel to meet these ores, particularly if the meeting-points furnish good market facilities for the product." This is a valuable hint. The same idea was in the mind of a writer in the *Iron Trade Review*, who argues long and well in favor of Marquette, Mich., as an iron centre, though his arguments are equally applicable to other points in the Northwest. The great inland region which we know by that name shows an increase of 60 per cent. in population in 1890 over 1880. Its railroad growth has also been continuous, while geographical lines bring it as near the Atlantic seaboard as is the territory tributary to Chicago. This section of the United States, 2,000 miles long by 300 wide, seems certain in time to achieve industrial independence. Theoretically the *Review* seems to establish its case, and to show the possibility of the assembling of pig-iron materials somewhere along Lake Superior as cheaply as is now done at Chicago or Pittsburgh. The situation in the Northwest apparently meets Mr. Birkinbine's conditions, yet the effect of climate and other drawbacks can be determined only by experience, and perhaps only after some losses.

Such extensions of the iron and steel industries do not imply a decline at the existing centres. The purchase by the Carnegie Company of one machine costing $1,000,000 has lately been reported, and it is well known in the trade that this wealthy company has lately been spending large sums in perfecting the mechanical appliances used in its plant so as to produce and handle pig-iron and steel with the least amount of human labor and at lowest cost. Perhaps nowhere else in the world can the manufacture of iron and steel be carried on with such small cost for wages per ton. Against such a rival it must be difficult for any new trade centre to arise and to maintain itself; yet, unless all indications fail, such an iron centre there will be somewhere on Lake Superior, and probably another near the Rocky Mountains. It is also possible that the iron industry of the country, as a whole, will by that time have reached the stage prophesied by Mr. Atkinson and Mr. Wells, when America will, under free-trade conditions, not only lead the world in output, but will be the producer to whom the consuming nations will look for their supplies.

TOCQUEVILLE'S SOUVENIRS.—I.

PARIS, March 31, 1893.

"LES morts vont vite." How distant already seems the figure of Alexis de Tocqueville, author of 'Democracy in America,' of 'The Old Régime and the Revolution'! The new generation has read these important works not much, if at all; it has chiefly taken its ideas from Taine and from Renan. Tocqueville is already become an "ancient"; Taine and Renan will probably have the same fate. Our age is not dogmatic; it hates general theories, general considerations, systems. Tocqueville is essentially dogmatic, his mind is of the same family as that of the author of the 'Esprit des Lois.' In his 'Democracy in America,' in his 'Old Régime and the Revolution,' you will look in vain for anything personal, for a portrait, for an anecdote. Tocqueville was a political philosopher more than a public man; he sat in the French Chambers, but, owing to certain qualities as well as certain defects, he never had much personal influence. He did not understand, he despised, what we call the *cuisine* of parties—what is called in England and in America the lobby. He was lost among men, like some superior spirit. He was conscious of the inferiority, the meanness, of the men who fill parliaments, and who, from the mere fact that they are representative men, must be of the average standard. He knew that he was not understood by them, he saw higher and further. The delicacy of his health, the refinement of his manner, a certain sort of timidity which always accompanies pride—everything tended to make of him a sort of stranger among his contemporaries. To those who knew him well—and I had that privilege—he was far more interesting a man than the majority of those who walk noisily on the political stage, and who fill the world with the bustle and clatter of a vulgar egotism.

But even to those who knew him best, Tocqueville remained somewhat of a mystery. Though, as I have said, he was essentially dogmatic, he was enigmatical. His mind was independent, his views were original, he attached himself to no leader. He had a sort of intellectual courage under which, nevertheless, there was a substratum of weakness, an organic weakness, which was probably a consequence of his delicate nature and health. He was not a man of action, though he was ambitious of political power and influence. He entered political life in 1839, when he was in the full maturity of his talents; but he played no important part between 1839 and 1848, during those last years of the parliamentary régime which had been inaugurated by the Revolution of 1830. In the 'Souvenirs,' which are now published and which were written at various times after the coup d'état which put an end to the second Republic, Tocqueville has a most interesting chapter on the Revolution of 1848 and its causes. He is, on the whole, very severe upon those who were the victims of this Revolution.

"I don't know," he says, "if ever a Parliament contained more varied and brilliant talents than ours during the last years of the July Monarchy. Nevertheless, I can affirm that all these great orators bored each other, and, what was worse, the nation was bored with their talk. It had come insensibly to see in the struggles of the Chamber intellectual fence rather than serious discussion, and in all that divided the various parliamentary groups—Majority, Left Centre, Dynastic Opposition—domestic quarrels between children of the same family trying to cheat each other. Certain corrupt acts, discovered by chance, had led the country to think that many such acts were concealed, that the class which controlled the Government was corrupt; and it had conceived for it a quiet contempt, which was mistaken for a satisfied and confiding submission."

The effect of the restriction of electoral rights was to divide the country in two parts, called the *pays légal*, the stratum which absorbed all political life, and the *residuum*, which was agitated by democratic and socialistic passions. Few people saw at the time as clearly as Tocqueville the rising importance of the social question. In October, 1847, he wrote a sort of manifesto, in which, having first described the languor of parliamentary life, he added:

"The time will come when our country will be again divided into two parties. The French Revolution abolished all privileges and destroyed all exclusive rights, but it left one standing—the right of property. Let property-owners cherish no illusions as to the strength of their situation, nor imagine that the right of property is an invincible rampart because so far it has never been stormed; for our time is like no other time. When the right of property was but the origin and foundation of many other rights, it defended itself easily, because it was not attacked; it formed the outer wall of society, and the other rights were the advanced defences. The blows did not reach it, and nobody ever thought seriously of attacking it. But now the right of property appears only like the last remnant of an aristocratic world which is no more; it stands alone, erect, an isolated privilege in the midst of a levelling society; it is no longer shielded by other rights more contested, more hated. Hence the situation is changed, and it is this right of property which alone bears every day the direct and incessant shock of democracy."

These words were really prophetic; Tocqueville saw the time approaching when the great struggle would be between those who possess something and those who possess nothing. He told the Chamber of Deputies over and over again that they must not be deceived by the quietness of the streets, by material order; that they must look beneath the surface and see what was in the minds and the heads of the lower classes. The Revolution of 1848 justified him almost too well; the edifice of the constitutional monarchy, of the *pays légal*, was shaken in a few hours, and nothing can be more instructive than the account given by Tocque-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ville of this extraordinary revolution, which was not provoked by any act of tyranny, but was the spontaneous effervescence of the socialist passions of Paris.

M. Thiers and M. Barrot were at the head of the Opposition in 1848. They put the match to a fire which was to devour themselves. "M. Barrot, who mingles a little silliness (*niaiserie*) with his weaknesses as well as his virtues," had been canvassing France and talking much at public banquets in favor of electoral reform. Tocqueville did not join the campaign of the banquets. He told his friends that they were playing a dangerous game. "At the Turkish Ambassador's I met Duvergier de Hauranne. I had some esteem and friendship for him, though he had nearly all the defects which party spirit can give. . . . I told him that I was afraid." Duvergier de Hauranne reassured him. His answer "painted exactly this man, resolute and narrow-minded; narrow with much intelligence, but an intelligence which, seeing well all that is confined in a certain horizon, does not imagine that the horizon can change; learned, disinterested, ardent, vindictive; of a sectarian race which makes politics through imitation of foreign nations and through historical reminiscence, which shuts up its mind within a single idea and gets heated and blinded by it."

I translate some of these short portraits of Tocqueville's, as they are remarkable for their severity and their terseness. Of M. Duchâtel, for instance, who was one of M. Guizot's colleagues in the Government, he says that he was "without prejudices, without vindictiveness, of an easy temper, always ready to oblige you when his interest allowed it; full of contempt and of amiability towards all." Guizot was "sickly, angular, often bitter and cutting." M. Hébert, the Minister of Justice, was a man "who resembled, more than any man I ever saw, a carnivorous animal." M. Dufaure, one of the principal members of the Opposition, "had a *sournois* mind and a sort of natural rusticity, mixed with much honesty." M. Molé concealed his egotism and ingratitude under an apparent openness and amiability.

The Revolution was begun by the National Guard, which wished simply to upset the Ministry. It was ended by what is called the people, who invaded the Chamber of Deputies. A self-elected provisional government proclaimed the Republic in the Hôtel de Ville. Tocqueville gives hour by hour an account of what he himself saw in these terrible days. Molé, Dufaure, Thiers, who had hoped for a moment to form a new Cabinet, disappeared in the tempest. The Duchess of Orleans, who had taken her young son to the Chamber of Deputies, had to retire before the crowd of the invaders. "I confess," says Tocqueville, "that what moved me most that day was the sight of that woman and child on whom fell the weight of faults which they had not committed. I looked with compassion on this foreign princess thrown among our civil discords; and when she fled, the memory of the sorrowful, mild, and firm countenance which she had maintained during the long agony in the Assembly, came back vividly to my mind." M. Thiers, meanwhile, "did not dare to return to his house. He had been seen for a moment in the Assembly before the arrival of the Duchess of Orleans, and he had almost immediately disappeared, giving the signal to many others. I heard the next day the details of his flight from M. Talabot, who had helped him execute it. . . . M. Thiers had been insulted by some men of the people; he followed, with M. Talabot, the quays of the Seine for a great distance, entered the Bois de Boulogne, and reëntered Paris by the barrier of Clichy."

If the Revolution of 1848 was called a mere surprise by many, Tocqueville does not consider it an accident. It was, he says, born of general causes—the industrial revolution which had made of Paris the first manufacturing city in the kingdom; the progress of socialistic ideas; the contempt into which the governing class had fallen; the centralization which gave the whole of France to the chance ruler of Paris. There were also accidental causes, the most important being what Tocqueville severely calls the "sort of senile imbecility of the King, a weakness which nobody could have foreseen." "I have often," he says, "asked myself what could have produced in the soul of the King this sudden and extraordinary weakness. Louis Philippe had spent his life in the midst of revolutions; he was surely not wanting in experience, in courage, in mind. I think that on that day his weakness came from the excess of his surprise; he was upset before he understood. The February Revolution was a surprise for all, but for him more than for anybody else." His mind for several years had retired into a sort of proud solitude; he was, besides, under the spell of historical reminiscences. I can cite a word uttered by the King to some alarmist, who spoke a few days before the event of the danger of a revolution: "Be reassured," said the King; "they have no Duc d'Orléans." It seemed to him that a Duc d'Orléans was a necessary factor in a revolution and in a great change.

Tocqueville witnessed the February Revolution with much concern; it seemed to him that France was never going to stop on the road to revolution. To his friend Ampère, who was more hopeful, and who praised the people of Paris, he said:

"You do not understand what is going on; you judge it like a *badaud* of Paris and like a poet. You call this the triumph of liberty; it is its defeat. I tell you that this people, whom you so innocently admire, has just shown that it is incapable and unworthy of living free. . . . It is always the same—as impatient, as thoughtless, as lawless, as weak in presence of the warning and rash in presence of the danger as its forefathers were. Time has changed it in nothing, and has left it as light-headed in serious things as it used to be in futile things."

After much quarrelling, they appealed to the future.

VASARI IN THE LIGHT OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

FLORENCE, March 12, 1893.

"THE Florentine masters," it has been said, "are the Dr. Johnsons of Art: they are so much more fascinating in the pages of their Boswell than in their own works." This illuminating paradox would lose none of its lustre, and would gain in force, if it were limited to the painters. It is certainly true that many Florentine painters who enjoy a considerable reputation because they figure in Vasari, would scarcely have roused a moment's curiosity if it had been left to their pictures to awaken it. A suspicion of this is now entering many people's minds, and it will soon be questioned whether our interest in Vasari's 'Vite' be not, after all, quite independent of the scores of second and third-rate pictures it celebrates; and whether it is not, by itself, and on its own account, one of the very greatest products of Tuscan genius.

Some such view of Vasari would account for the hold he has not only upon people who read him as literature, but upon students of the history of art. They soon discover that he is not an historian of the late Prof. Freeman's kind—in fact, that he never in his life consulted a document; and, worse still, that he rarely made accurate use of the information he had gathered. He abounds in contradictions; he makes long excursions on loop-lines to kick an enemy or to puff a friend; a tenth-rate painter working under the shadow of Brunelleschi's dome is more interesting to him than a great master elsewhere—and yet one comes back to him with an ever-increasing sense of his charm and fascination. He has this charm and fascination because he wrote down with the naïveté of an Herodotus the folk-lore, romance, and gossip that had, in the course of two centuries, gathered in profusion about the artists, a class of people who in Florence formed a more prominent and more self-conscious part of the community than they did in any other Italian city. Their fellow-townsmen, therefore, took the keenest imaginable interest in them both as a class and as individuals, and heard and repeated stories about them with that delight in personal anecdote which was the distinguishing mark of the Florentine populace and of their literature. It was for such a public that Vasari wrote, and this accounts for his method and his success. He had to be personal, gossipy, and readable. His unerring sense of the readable made him arrange his material in a way that would catch the eye, no matter at what cost to mere veracity, and for that reason he succeeded where others failed.

The student of history soon learns to assume that every success in any definite line of achievement is preceded and surrounded by a great many attempts in the same direction. Even if we lacked positive information, we might be sure that Vasari was not the first nor the only Italian to write lives of painters. As a matter of fact, Vasari's publication stopped many who were at that very time occupied with the same task, as was the case, for instance, with the "Anonimo Morelliano" (probably the Venetian Michiel). In further proof of this we may cite Prof. Carl Frey's recent publication of the materials which an unknown Florentine contemporary of Vasari was preparing for a history of art.* The difference in spirit between this writer and Vasari appears, however, in an instant. The "Anonimo Magliabecchiano" is a scholarly compiler who gathers material from all the books and manuscripts he can lay hold of, not only about the artists of antiquity and of the recent past, but about living masters. It does not occur to him to criticise his material, nor does he seem to have taken the trouble to look at the works of art that he might have seen by sticking his head out of the window. In fact, he mentions their works merely as points connected with the lives of the artists, not as the primary cause of interest in them. Vasari, on the contrary, always describes a picture or a statue with the vividness of a man who saw the thing while he wrote about it, and saw it so vividly that he did not think of looking up his notes. Nor does Vasari ever forget that the capital fact in the artist's career is his work. But a still more striking difference between the "Anonimo" and Vasari is that the latter clearly realizes the difference between the ancient and the modern world—a division which scarcely exists for the "Anonimo." Indeed, Vasari was one of the first writers to feel that modern civilization was a thing by itself, and not merely the resuscitation of a glorious past. Hence, in his first edition, he began at once with Cimabue,

*'Il Codice Magliabecchiano.' Berlin: Grote'sche Verlag. 1892.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and only because he found that this shocked his contemporaries did he prefix, by way of introduction to his second edition, an essay on the art of the ancients.

The modern world begins for Vasari with Cimabue, and he has a complete scheme of the growth of the arts from Cimabue to their culmination in his worshipped master, Michelangelo. That this scheme was not Vasari's invention was clearly proved by the "Anonimo," who, after he once gets to Cimabue, follows out the later history of art on much the same plan. Prof. Frey prefaces his edition of the "Anonimo" with an essay on Vasari's predecessors, in which it is proved that, at the end of the fifteenth century, fifty years before Vasari wrote, the Florentines were already well aware who their great masters were. Even a generation earlier, Landino, in his Dante Commentary, gives the names of Cimabue, Giotto, Taddeo Gaddi, Masaccio, Fra Angelico, Fra Filippo, Paolo Uccello, and Andrea del Castagno, as the names of great painters no longer living; Brunelleschi, Ghiberti, Donatello, and Desiderio, as the great sculptors. Of Desiderio, Landino speaks in terms repeated not only by the "Anonimo," but, almost word for word, by Vasari himself: "And if an utterly untimely death had not snatched him away in his early years, he would have attained, as every one acquainted with the arts expected, to the utmost perfection."

A tradition of criticism can, however, be traced much farther back than Landino. In a certain sense Dante himself may be looked upon as having caused the first study of Italian art. Even in the fourteenth century, his commentators had already begun to explain his reference to Cimabue and Giotto, and, in the fifteenth, the commentary on the famous lines spoken by Oderisi expanded into a sketch of the history of art from Giotto downwards. Not only in this indirect way is Dante to be considered the founder of art study, but he actually started one of the most popular art legends by his phrases "Cimabue nella pintura tener lo campo" and "ora ha Giotto il grido," thus giving an importance to Cimabue which he otherwise certainly would not have had. It is clearly proved that this, and this alone, gave rise to the elaborate romance which has made Cimabue as familiar a name as Giotto.†

The Cimabue legend does not, however, appear to have been at all elaborated before the end of the fifteenth century. Simultaneously with the "Anonimo Magliabecchiano," Prof. Frey has published 'Il Libro di Antonio Billi,' a work of the same nature, but briefer, written at different times towards the end of the fifteenth century and the first quarter of the sixteenth.‡ This note-book is of great importance, both because it shows what point the study of art had reached by the end of the fifteenth century, and because it was the common source of Vasari and the "Anonimo." The latter, being merely the crude material for a book, although already arranged in order, embodies Billi's notes unchanged, while Vasari of course adapts Billi more to his own style. It is in Billi that the story first occurs about Cimabue's Madonna being carried to Santa Maria Novella amid great rejoicing and to the sound of trumpets. Giotto's personality, on the contrary, was already fixed in the fourteenth century, and his importance fully appreciated. Boccaccio, in the 'Decameron' (vi, 5), calls him "one of the glories of Florence, he who brought to light again an art buried for many centuries, and painted so wonderfully that his pictures cannot be called likenesses, for they are identical with the life, for which people mistook them." (Of course Boccaccio himself owes his æsthetics to Pliny, who in turn owes his to the Greeks; but it is curious to find him already making use of the phrase which occurs constantly in Vasari, "pare vivo"—"seems alive.") The same critique of Giotto is found, word for word, both in the "Anonimo" and in his source, Antonio Billi. The story, however, of Giotto being discovered by Cimabue drawing sheep on a stone occurs for the first time in Ghiberti, who wrote his commentaries about 1450.

In fact, not only did the legends about popular painters gather in volume with the lapse of time, but the list of their works shared the same tendency to expansion. Filippo Villani, for instance, speaks of Cimabue, but mentions none of his works, nor does Landino; F. Alberti, writing in 1510, mentions two or three; Billi and the "Anonimo" cite quite a number, while Vasari does not hesitate to attribute to him everything "nella maniera bizantina" he can find. It is the same with Giotto, only that in his case the growth of the legend is directly due to the Dante commentators. Basing themselves on the probable fact that Giotto and Dante were acquainted, they were on the lookout for signs of the influence of their master on his great painter-friend, and wherever they found a face supposed to be that of Dante, as in the Bargello Chapel, or a subject connected in the remotest way with Hell or Purgatory, they unhesitatingly ascribed the picture to Giotto. The attribution to him of the frescoes of the Bargello Chapel can be traced back to Ghiberti, whose commentaries had a great influence upon all later Florentine art-historians; but Billi is the first to attribute to Giotto the Apocalypse in the Incoronata at Naples, adding that it was painted, "it was said, with the help of Dante, who, being in exile, wandered thither unknown." The "Anonimo" goes so far as to attribute to Giotto the frescoes in the choir of Santa Croce, indisputably by Agnolo Gaddi, thus showing that Giotto had, in the middle of the sixteenth century, become almost as generic a name as Raphael was in the last century.

The "Anonimo" felt that he must, if possible, connect some anecdote or startling fact with every artist; in this, as in everything, following the lead of Pliny. The startling fact which he connects with Orcagna, for example, is that he was paid 86,000 ducats for his tabernacle in Or San Michele. This is the earliest indication of the spirit which leads the Italian sacristan of to-day to tell us, while he is unveiling a picture, that the Queen of England offered 500,000 francs for it.

The good stories about Brunelleschi, told by Vasari with sympathetic garrulity, can be traced through the "Anonimo" and through Billi, and are found fixed already in Manetti, who, about 1480, wrote a life of Brunelleschi. The farther back they are traced, however, the more do they approach the baldness of fact. Thus, Manetti has the story about Della Luna's spoiling the Innocenti, but not Brunelleschi's retort: "There was one error in the building of San Giovanni, and you have picked it out for a model." Even the "Anonimo," although he speaks of the crucifix Brunelleschi had made in rivalry with Donatello, knows nothing of Vasari's *novella*, ending with Donatello's ejaculation, "You were made to carve Christs, and I clodhoppers." Billi relates that "even a woman had dared" to offer a model for the lantern of the cupola, but Vasari, to make it more gossipy, adds that she belonged to the famous Gaddi family. In one or two instances, however, Vasari sacrifices the point of a story for ulterior purposes. Billi, for instance, relates that "Donatello was in Siena, making a door for the cathedral. One day a goldsmith, Bernardetto di Mona Papera, happened to be passing through on his way from Rome. He was a friend of Donatello, so he called on him, and, beholding the splendid work, he reproached him for giving the Sienese so fine a thing to boast of. His words had such an effect that on a feast-day, when the apprentices had gone out to make holiday, Donatello and Bernardetto ruined everything, and, leaving the house, took the road for Florence. The apprentices coming home at night found everything ruined, and no Donatello; and not a word did they hear of him until he was safe in Florence." It would be hard to find an anecdote in which was combined to such a degree the Florentine's hatred of the Sienese and his consciousness of the splendor and glory bestowed upon a town by the works of arts within its walls. But Vasari, wishing, perhaps, to reconcile the Sienese, who, while he was writing, were being annexed to Florence, does not tell what arguments Bernardetto used with Donatello.

Poor Vasari has been most unmercifully cuffed about of late for accusing Castagno of murdering Domenico Veneziano, when, as a matter of fact, Domenico outlived Castagno. But Vasari can no longer be blamed for inventing this calumny. Billi relates it, and as he notes down only what he finds, the tale must have been already current at the end of the fifteenth century. It is more than likely that the story-spinning mind of the Florentines cooked up this murder as a criticism on Castagno's works. His energetic, gruff, almost brutal apostles and saints led to the conclusion that their painter must have been a very wicked man, just as nowadays Perugino's sweet, dreamy, beatified faces and eternally peaceful landscapes make it next to impossible to doubt, in spite of positive information to the contrary, that Perugino had an angelic nature.

Accuracy was not in the historical spirit of the sixteenth century. The "Anonimo Magliabecchiano" is quite as inaccurate as Vasari himself. Had he succeeded in becoming our chief source of knowledge on Italian painting, we should have been no nearer to accuracy than we are now with Vasari as our guide. We should simply have had another set of grotesque theories to refute, and another set of false attributions to put straight. To make Perugino the pupil of Botticelli, as the "Anonimo" does, is no better than making Timoteo della Vite the pupil, instead of the master, of Raphael. Vasari, moreover, is not guilty of anything so gross as the "Anonimo's" attribution of Ghirlandaio's "Last Supper" in the Ognisanti to Botticelli. This proves what has already been said, that the "Anonimo" never looked at pictures. The personal anecdote is his real interest, although he has none of that narrative power and dramatic sense which put Vasari on a level with Boccaccio and with the best *raconteurs* of all times. Botticelli's "crankiness," for example, interests him more than his works, and he begins his account of Sandro with a story not reported by Vasari:

"Tommaso Soderini was persuading him to get married. 'I will tell you,' answered Sandro, 'what happened a few nights ago. I dreamt I was married, and it made me so wretched that, to avoid falling asleep and having the dream over again, I got up, and all night rushed about the streets of Florence as if I were mad.' Thereupon Messer Tommaso saw

†See F. Wickhoff, 'Die Zeit des Guido von Siena.' Mittellungen des Instituts für oesterreichische Geschichtsforschung. Innsbruck. Vol. X.

‡'Il Libro di Antonio Billi.' Berlin: Grote'sche Verlag. 1892.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that Sandro was not the soil to plant a vineyard in."

In the same way, although the "Anonimo" devotes scant space to Leonardo and Michelangelo, he dwells at length upon Leonardo's beauty and personal qualities, and upon Michelangelo's bitter feeling towards his great rival. "Leonardo was passing where a number of well-to-do people were discussing a passage in Dante. They stopped him for his opinion. But Michelangelo happening to come along at that very moment, Leonardo answered: 'Michelangelo will explain it to you.' This put Michelangelo into a fury: 'Explain it yourself, you who made a model for a horse, to cast it in bronze, and could not cast it, and so let it go for shame.'" Another time he shouted to Leonardo: "So those capons of Milanese believed all you said, did they?" ("Et che t'era creduto da que caponj de Melanesj?") If the late Senator Morelli had known these documents, he would have found in them curious confirmation of his theory that any given old master always painted hands in the same way. "Filippino generally made one hand larger than another, and was aware of the fault but could not change it."

Neither Billi nor the "Anonimo" offers any fresh information. I believe the only fact of the least consequence to the history of art in either is the "Anonimo's" statement that Botticelli painted in January, 1473, a St. Sebastian that was in Santa Maria Maggiore. There is every reason to think that this St. Sebastian is the one now in Berlin, and the date is valuable as one of the few points in Sandro's career upon which to base a theory of his development.

Not only do these new documents furnish no useful supplementary information, but they are fearfully meagre as compared with Vasari, although, among modern artists, they deal with the Florentines only. They say, it is true, a few words about the Sienese *Trecentisti*, but that only because they had Ghiberti's appreciative account of the Sienese before their eyes. Otherwise, they seem utterly blind to the existence of painters outside of Florence. Signorelli and Perugino are barely mentioned, and Raphael's name does not so much as occur. How different this is from the comprehensive sweep Vasari had! To him Florence was, of course, the eye of the universe, the Florentine artists were the greatest of modern times. His 'Vite' is so full of this conviction, and he has so won over his readers to it, that even today it sounds almost blasphemous to demur to this towering preëminence of the Florentines. Yet Vasari was an Italian as well as a Tuscan, and every artist in Italy interested him. He was a very busy man, a practising architect and a prolific painter, so he was often forced to rely on correspondents who were no less inclined to overestimate their own local painters than Vasari himself was when he spoke of any one from Arezzo. But it is not hard to distinguish these interpolations. Wherever Vasari speaks of what he has seen—and he saw nearly all the best work in Italy—and where he is not led astray by what may be called Albert-Wolffism, he is a singularly warm, generous, and appreciative critic. He feels instinctively, too, that the first function of the popular writer on art is to be interpretative. Everything considered, his interpretation is still the best there is. He is not as penetrating as Mr. Pater, nor so fantastical and poetical as Mr. Ruskin, but he is broader than either, and in closer sympathy with actual humanity. Among Italians, Vasari simply has no rival at all. Billi and the "Anonimo" make no attempt whatever at interpretation, and later writers, like Ridolfi, Baldinucci, and even Boschini, were incapable of writing down their impressions if they had any.

The chief use of the "Anonimo" and Billi is, therefore, to turn our minds to a kindlier view of Messer Giorgio. He was, to be sure, a true son of his age, and had no sense of the document. Billi and the "Anonimo" appreciate the value of documents even less. For documents we must look elsewhere. But Vasari is still the unrivalled critic of Italian art, and, regarded as literature, he was one of the great prose-writers of Italy, and the last important product of the novelistic tendency in Tuscan genius.

B. Berenson.

Correspondence.

SUNDRY CONSIDERATIONS.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: The *Evening Post* says that the pension business is the despair of everybody at Washington; that it is regarded as probable that the amount required may reach $200,000,000 in one year; that nobody knows what to do about it, and that Mr. Cleveland is giving it anxious thought as the most important item of his Administration. It seems as if the simplest logic would suggest that the first thing is to give the national Treasury a chance to be heard. There is not a single man in Congress who has any authority or responsibility for acting as guardian of the national finances. The Committee of Ways and Means represents so many 340ths of the nation, the Committee on Appropriations so many other 340ths, and both together but a small fraction of the 340ths who care very little for the national finances, and a very great deal for conciliating the most active of their constituents and the most powerful members of the lobby. What is wanted is to send a national watch-dog to sit on his haunches and howl in front of the Speaker's desk, and if need be teach members of Congress that he can bite—that is, place them in an attitude before their constituents which they would find exceedingly detrimental.

From your last number it appears that, notwithstanding twenty-five years of public agitation of civil-service reform, with its labor and expense, the spoils system is about as great a scandal and nuisance as ever, and there is much less prospect that Congress will extend the reform than that it will sweep away what has been already done. Now it is evident that no political appointments can be made except by the direct action of heads of departments, with the consent of the President. If those heads of departments could be placed in a position of public responsibility, so that any independent member of Congress could directly cross-examine them as to why they removed such a man, and why they appointed such another, and they could not evade an explicit answer, this simple expedient would do more for reform in a single session than has the Civil-Service Commission since it was created. That is precisely the way in which the English Civil-Service Act, established in 1852, has worked on steadily and quietly, without requiring any public agitation or intervention of any kind.

Your article on the Missing Link shows with great force how the voters do not see or understand anything of the proceedings of the Legislature or of its members; how they have no reason for voting for or against candidates except the party nominations in caucus; and that thus they get no political education and can neither form nor express political opinions. Your remedy is that the members should be required to meet their constituents and explain their political action. But the trouble is, that the members have nothing to explain. Under the system of doing all business in standing committees, and, whether it is good or evil, by means of underhand intrigue and wire-pulling, and then forcing it through the houses by party combinations, the members understand the real reasons as little as their constituents, and are just as purely voting automata. The fact is, that the guidance of legislation is just as much executive work as any other part of administration. If the business could be taken up with system and under official leaders, one thing being handled at a time, with public debate and immediate settlement by vote, the people would soon begin to take interest in and understand their members, with very powerful effect upon the result.

From all which it follows that the urgent need of our politics, whether national or State, is that public contact of executive and legislature which is implied in giving seats in the Legislature to the chief executive officials; and the only real obstacle is the jealousy of the Legislature, and the failure of the people to understand the importance of the subject. If Mr. Cleveland wishes to cover himself with immortal glory, he has only to send a message, nominally addressed to Congress, but really to the people of the United States, with a categorical demand for this very thing; and if the Democratic party wishes to seize its real opportunity, it will see to it that the issue is spread abroad through the whole country.

G. B.

Boston, April 8, 1893.

A SERVANT MISSION AMONG THE FREEDMEN.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: As has often been said, the best gift to the children of the poor is the power to help themselves—to make it possible for them, by their own exertions, to escape from the thraldom of poverty. This best gift it is the object of the Mission School of Cookery and Housework of Washington to bestow upon the ignorant colored girls that swarm in this beautiful city. And by teaching those naturally untidy and shiftless girls habits of neatness and thrift, and how to cook wholesome and palatable food, the Mission School is making a practical contribution to the solution of the problem of a good domestic service for this city. Altogether about 130 girls are taught each year how to do housework and plain cooking, including the cooking of meats, vegetables, plain desserts, bread, rolls, and plain cake.

Mrs. Anna Lowell Woodbury, the founder, has given many years of her life and a large sum of money to this admirable charity. She began the work in 1879, and has carried it on quietly and unostentatiously, but with steady success, until it is now one of the oldest and most estimable private charities in the city. It is considered a model of its kind. The excellence and simplicity of its methods and the scrupulous neatness—which is the first thing that impresses one on entering the school—have attracted the attention of visitors not only from our own States but from foreign countries.

Such an institution cannot fail to have ramifying relations to the community also. Its civilizing and sanitary effects penetrate the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

homes of the very poor and suggest more healthful ways of living. So the school often carries into those homes a new spirit and power of helpfulness to overworked mothers, or in filling their places, bringing rest and comfort where they are seldom known.

The officers of the school are: Mrs. A. L. Woodbury, President; Mrs. Hugh McCulloch, Vice-President; Miss Tuckerman and Miss Katherine Hosmer, Secretaries, and Mrs. S. C. Miller, Treasurer.

The school is supported entirely by private subscriptions, and teaches a large number of pupils free of charge. It has now reached a stage at which it is thought desirable to extend its operations and place it on a more permanent basis. But to do this it will need further contributions. Those who wish to aid in a most practical and beneficent (and, it may be said, national) work can hardly find one more deserving, and may be sure that any contributions sent to the Treasurer—Mrs. S. C. Miller, at the school building, No. 1228 N Street, N. W., Washington, D. C.—will be gratefully received and carefully expended. N. H. T.

WASHINGTON, April 6, 1893.

THE CLEFT INFINITIVE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Somewhat parsimonious, it strikes me, is the justice which Prof. Adams Sherman Hill, in his book recently published, 'The Foundations of Rhetoric,' dispenses to my treatment of this subject, as I handled it in 1882.

As if I had labored to poor purpose in connection with it, he speaks of my having merely "adduced what, at first sight, seems to be a formidable array of citations" of phrases like *to publicly chastise*, "ranging from the time of Wickliffe to the present day." None but a most meagre account of my citations being given, however, the reader is tacitly asked to take it for granted, on the strength of what is little better than a bare assertion, that they are hardly more substantial than Falstaff's "rogues in buckram."

For, "on examination," Prof. Hill goes on to comment, "it turns out that the names of some of the highest authorities on a question of good use—Addison, Goldsmith, and Cardinal Newman, for instance—are conspicuous by their absence." This I quote in passing, and reply to it. If Prof. Hill had communicated with me, before going to press, he would have learned, inappreciably as the fact imports my contention, that neither Goldsmith nor Cardinal Newman, any more than Dr. Johnson, Lord Macaulay, or De Quincey, despised the cleft or divided infinitive altogether. I am now able to appeal to both of them for it. As regards Addison, whether he will not be found to keep them company may, moreover, be prudently queried. My notes on his English, made at least thirty years ago, are not much concerned with his constructions, but are confined pretty exclusively to his vocabulary. In presence of producible warrants for the cleft infinitive, his recognition of it would, I repeat, matter next to nothing.

Still digressing, I must confess to mild surprise that a "Professor of Rhetoric and Oratory," as Mr. Hill is, should include Addison and Goldsmith among "the highest authorities on a question of good use." Agreeable as they are, it may be doubted whether any two equally voluminous writers of the last century, or of the present, could be more abundantly quoted for "use" quite the contrary of "good." As to the former of these classics, no judge whose opinion is worth a hearing will now subscribe to the pronouncement of Dr. Johnson, that "whoever wishes to attain an English style, familiar but not coarse, and elegant but not ostentatious, must give his days and nights to the volumes of Addison." If "an elegant style" can consist with the frequent employment of words inexactly, marked slovenliness of idiom, and a negligence of grammar occasionally approaching the autocratic, then, and only then, is it allowable to describe the style of Addison, so nearly allied to that of Goldsmith, as elegant. One may, I think, rather characterize it as gracefully dishevelled. Such has long been my estimate of it, and, on turning over the *Spectator* anew for five or six hours, I see no occasion to alter that estimate. With the imitators of Addison and Goldsmith, moreover, it has seldom fared otherwise than with kindred imitators. To a sane taste their mimicry, for the most part, certainly ranks, for abortiveness, with the flatulent intumescence of Dr. Parr, or with Mr. Hepworth Dixon's "middle-class Macaulayese."

With reference to the interposal of a word or words between *to* and the infinitive, the Reverend John Earle, Professor of Anglo-Saxon in the University of Oxford, has lately written:

"It has been shewn, by Dr. Fitzedward Hall, that this usage has been continuous from the fourteenth century to the eighteenth; so that the strange thing is, how it came to be interrupted, as it has been, by Dr. Johnson, Macaulay, and De Quincey. It almost seems as if these influential writers had created a new custom, upon which the revival of a very old practice had returned like an innovation." *Philology of the English Tongue* (ed. 1892), p. 539.

My paper on the cleft infinitive, printed in the *American Journal of Philology*, is, thus, treated favorably by a learned and critical Englishman. But that paper, which I could now improve, appeared, as has been said, ten years ago; and I have been enabled, meantime, to add largely to the quotations there given. What offers itself in the way of farther argument being reserved for a little space, my new quotations, selected from the stock lying at my elbow, after the rejection of upwards of a hundred, here follow:

"*To neuer die* againe." Joshua Sylvester, *Eden* (1598), *Works* (1605-7), Vol. I., p. 297.

"*To once name.*" Richard Bernard, *Terence in English* (1598), p. 261 (ed. 1607).

"*To well discerne.*" Edward Grimstone, *Acosta* (1604), p. 97.

"*To quite rid* himselfe out of thraldome." G. Woodcocke, *Ivstine* (1606), fol. 23 *r.*

"*To punish'd be.*" Lady Mary Wroath, *Urania, Pamphilia to Amphilanthus* (1621), p. 33.

"*To truely judge.*" John Done, *Polydoron* (1631), p. 133. Similar phrases occur in pp. 63, 69, 72, 78, 102.

"*To both shine and burne.*" Rev. Richard Carpenter. *Experience*, etc. (1642), I., xvi., 115.

"*To not wonder.*" Robert Gentilis, *Considerations*, etc. (1650), p. 45. See also pp. 51, 95, 102, 137, 140, 163 (*ter*), 172, 189, 236.

"*To so habituate* Nature, that," etc. Edmund Gayton, *Pleasant Notes upon Don Quixot* (1654), p. 8.

"*To first lay . . .* means for that end." Rev. John Sergeant, *Schism Dispach't* (1657), p. 96.

"*To never let,*" "*to either scare or incourage.*" Rev. Dr. Henry More, *A Brief Reply* (1672), pp. 208, 301.

"*To quite overflow them.*" *Id.*, *Exposition of Daniel* (1681), p. 161.

"*To more illustrate.*" Dr. R. Burthogge, *An Essay upon Reason*, etc. (1694), p. 135.

"*To exactly copy.*" Edward Ward, *Hudibras Redivivus* (1707), Preface. Twenty-three more like collocations are found in the book.

"*To rightly judge.*" *Id.*, *British Hudibras* (1710), p. 20. See also pp. 40, 119, 123, 151, 166.

"*To neither stick or boggle,*" "*to so affront.*" Anon., *The Welsh-Monster* (about 1712), pp. 11, 18.

"*To wholly or compulsively extinguish.*" Rev. Myles Davies, *Athenae Britannicae* (1716), Vol. III., *A Critical History*, etc., p. 14.

"*To far out-weigh.*" Anon., *Letters from Mist's Journal* (1722), Vol. I., p. 304.

"*To further divide.*" Jethro Tull, *Horse-hoeing Husbandry* (1731-39), p. 61 (ed. 1822). See also pp. 96, 134.

"*To either animate or cool* the Feet." W. Horsley, *The Fool* (1746-47), Vol. I., p. 9 (1748). See also Vol. I., pp. 40, 270, 292, and Vol. II., p. 99.

"*To justly fright me.*" Anon., *The Female Foundling* (1751), Vol. II., p. 78.

"*To really value.*" Sarah Fielding, *The Adventures of David Simple*, Vol. III. (1752), p. 33 (ed. 1753).

"*To entirely destroy,*" "*to even mention.*" William Toldervy, *The History of Two Orphans* (1756), Vol. I., p. 194; Vol. IV., p. 127.

"*To better inform it.*" Mrs. Elizabeth Griffith, *Letters between Henry and Frances* (1757), Vol. II., p. 90 (ed. 1767).

"*To industriously seek.*" Mrs. Charlotte Lennox, *Henrietta* (1758), Vol. II., p. 158 (ed. 1761).

"*To only touch the back,*" etc. Goldsmith (1762), *Miscellaneous Works* (ed. 1837), Vol. III., p. 325.

"*To ruinously confound,*" "*to essentially injure.*" Anon., *The Woman of Honor* (1768), Vol. I., p. 34; Vol. III., p. 103.

"*To seriously and impartially consider.*" Thomas Hull, *The History of Sir William Harrington* (1771), Vol. II., p. 135 (ed. 1797).

"*To quite subdue.*" Miss Frances Burney (1768), *Early Diary* (1889), Vol. I., p. 10. In the same work there are sixteen similar expressions.

"*To immediately take.*" *Id.*, *Evelina* (1778), Letter 16. See also Lett. 19, 51 (*bis*), 79.

"*To silently wish.*" Miss G. E. Burney (1779), in Miss Frances Burney's *Early Diary* (1889), Vol. II., p. 269.

"*To readily guess,*" "*to positively oblige,*" "*to generously declare.*" Anon., *Fashionable Follies* (1782), Vol. I., pp. 76, 187; Vol. II., p. 255.

"*To personally chastise,*" "*to directly oppose,*" "*to entirely drown.*" *The New Spectator* (1784), No. 6, p. 3; No. 17, p. 2; No. 21, p. 2.

"*To heartily forgive.*" Anon., *Letters to Honoria and Marianne* (1784), Vol. III., p. 29.

"*To further explain.*" Miss Ann Hilditch, *Rosa de Montmorien* (1787), Vol. I., p. 173.

"*To publicly chastise.*" Anon., *Generous Attachment* (1787), Vol. IV., p. 196.

"*To thoroughly comprehend.*" Jeremy Bentham (1790), *Works* (1838-43), Vol. X., p. 235.

"*To openly avow,*" "*to even rest.*" Anon., *Cicely* (1795), Vol. IV., pp. 130, 141.

"*To entirely exclude.*" Sir Humphry Davy, in Beddoes's *Contributions to Physical and Medical Knowledge* (1799), p. 131.

"*To fashionably and carelessly look in* at Tattersall's." *Morning Post* (1799), in *Spirit of the Public Journals*, Vol. III. (1800), p. 121.

"*To entirely satisfy.*" London *Times* (1801), *ibid.*, Vol. V. (1802), p. 345.

"*To eagerly cram.*" *Morning Post* (1801), *ibid.*, Vol. V. (1802), p. 359.

"*To again postpone.*" Anon., *Lusignan* (1801), Vol. I., p. 86.

"*To particularly avoid,*" "*to immediately adopt.*" Elizabeth Helme, *St. Margaret's Cave* (1801), Vol. III., p. 113; Vol. IV., p. 95.

"*To merely reply.*" Maria Vanzee, *Fate* (1803), p. 137.

"*To so misbehave.*" Lord Nelson (about 1803) in Southey's *Life of Nelson* (ed. 1813), Vol. II., p. 189.

"*To something like hate* them," "*to first begin,*" "*to manifestly prove,*" "*to eagerly acknowledge.*" Thomas Holcroft, *Bryan Perdue* (1805), Vol. I., pp. 167, 239; Vol. II., p. 13.

"*To ardently desire.*" Rev. Sydney Smith, *Sermons* (1809), Vol. II., p. 294.

"*To openly serve,*" "*to kindly commiserate.*" Anon., *The Reformist* (1810), Vol. I., p. 186; Vol. II., p. 34.

"*To continually ask.*" Dr. Thomas Busby, *Lucretius* (1813), Preface. Eleven more like phrases occur in the same work.

"*To perfectly congeal.*" Mrs. Mary Pilkington, *Celebrity* (1815), Vol. II., p. 13.

"*To materially affect.*" H. T. Colebrooke, *On Import of Colonial Corn* (1818), p. 10.

"*To indignantly fling.*" Sir John Bowring, in the *Westminster Review* (1827), Vol. VII., p. 327.

"*To barely rise.*" Cardinal Newman (1833), *Letters* (1891), Vol. I., p. 381.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"*To much relish.*" William Beckford, *Recollections*, etc. (1835), p. 149.
"*To more than insinuate.*" London *Times*, Jan. 15, 1839, in *Spirit of the Metropol. Conserv. Press* (1840), Vol. I., p. 20.
"*To utterly extinguish.*" *Morning Herald*, Sept. 17, 1839, *ibid.*, Vol. II., p. 389.
"*To cheaply decorate.*" Rev. G. S. Faber, *Provincial Letters* (1842), Vol. II., p. 297 (ed. 1844).
"*To alone make.*" Caroline Fox (1846), *Memories of Old Friends* (1882), p. 206.
"*To either eat, drink, or smoke.*" Hon. and Rev. S. G. Osborne, in Lord Ingestre's *Meliora*, Vol. I., p. 8 (1852).
"*To extensively alter.*" *Saturday Review*, Vol. XI., p. 579 (1861).
"*To quite please.*" James Spedding (1861), *Reviews*, etc. (1879), p. 270.
"*To even contract.*" Sir W. R. Hamilton (1861), in the Rev. R. P. Graves's *Life*, etc. Vol. III., p. 567 (1889).
"*To fairly unite.*" Matthew Arnold, *On the Study of Celtic Literature* (1867), p. 22.
"*To first take.*" "George Eliot," *Daniel Deronda* (1876), Vol. II., p. 296.
"*To absolutely detest.*" Mr. Leslie Stephen, *Hours in a Library* (1876), Vol. II., p. 3.
"*To really raise.*" Mr. J. W. Sherer, *The Conjuror's Daughter* (1880), p. 30.
"*To personally conduct.*" Mr. P. S. Robinson, *Saints and Sinners* (1883), p. 324.
"*To immediately apologize.*" Laurence Oliphant, *Altiora Peto* (1883), Vol. I., p. 181.
"*To properly and safely affect,*" "*to successfully overcome.*" *Id.*, *Sympneumata* (1885), pp. 27, 47.
"*To really understand.*" *Id.*, *Haifa* (1887), p. 192.
"*To at least suggest.*" Rev. Professor John Earle, *English Prose*, etc. (1890), p. 377.
"*To more than hint* a suspicion." London *Times*, Oct. 3, 1892, leader on *Death of M. Renan*.

To return to Professor Hill, "some students of language," he observes, "insist that good use sanctions, or at least condones," the cleft infinitive, and, one is to infer, consequently accede to it. But, without specifying them, he names me immediately afterwards; and his readers will, doubtless, suppose that I am of the number. Yet I am not so. I have distinctly said, as he ought to have acknowledged, that, though the ambiguity of "honour teaches us *properly to respect ourselves*" is obviated by putting *to properly respect ourselves*, yet it is preferable to write *to respect ourselves properly*. As regards my own practice, if I may be excused for speaking of it, never once have I indulged in a construction like that which I thus proposed to reform, by doing away with *to properly respect*. It does not at all follow, because one discusses a contested locution historically, and consents to view it under divers aspects, that it has one's approval. There are those, obviously, to whom, from ignoring the personal equation, nothing but explicit praise or dispraise is clearly intelligible.

Though an observer of style may entertain little liking for the cleft infinitive, it is not laid on him, in view of relevant facts, to imitate Prof. Hill's unsparing reprobation of it. The English-speaking world in general is, to be sure, fast coming round to its free employment; but, haply, there is a certain Nemo whose fancy it does not hit. This aversion of His Insignificance is, however, an unobtruded and unobtrusible private peculiarity; and he has never so much as dreamed that he was authorized to fulminate an adverse judgment on humanity at large for not adopting it. Very far is it from him, accordingly, to pronounce, after the manner of Prof. Hill, that "writers who know their business" will be at the pains to shun the cleft infinitive absolutely; a deliverance which somehow carries a reminder of ukasing. But, while it is not given to Nemo to autocratize, still he is at liberty, like everybody else, to try his hand in the prophetic line. And his twopenny venture at forecast is, that, before very long, the use of the cleft infinitive, wherever it shall contribute to euphony, terseness, or avoidance of ambiguity, will be accounted not only permissible, but laudable. Its sporadic presence in English literature for more than four centuries is, undeniably, evidence of its not conflicting with the genius of our language, just as is the verb *to atone;* and the occasional acceptance of it by writers of the rank of Dr. Henry More, Sir Thomas Browne, Dr. Bentley, De Foe, Dr. Johnson, Burke, Bentham, Southey, Coleridge, Sydney Smith, Charles Lamb, Sir John Bowring, Cardinal Newman, Lord Macaulay, De Quincey, Mr. Herbert Spencer, Matthew Arnold, Mr. Ruskin, Bp. Samuel Wilberforce, "George Eliot," and Mr. Leslie Stephen, is not safely to be set to the account of oversight. Not seldom, especially when one is talking, it seems to offer itself spontaneously, as it were; and there are few but risk it once in a way. "No stronger case has been made" for it, says Prof. Hill, than could be made for a practice common with Miss Austen, which may be exemplified in "*No one* can ever be in love more than once in *their* life." Hitherto I have failed of convincing him to the contrary. Will he now, unlike Pontius Pilate, unwrite his ἔγραφα?

"Even if good use were divided," so as to allow an option between the uncleft infinitive and the cleft, Prof. Hill apprehends "danger that soon we may [*read* might] have expressions like Herrick's 'to incense burn,'" and outrageous sandwiching after the pattern of Bishop Pecock's. The objection is of the same stamp as that of Mr. G. P. Marsh, who contends that, if we tolerate *is being made*, we "must, in consistency," tolerate *would have been being made*, and so on. Similarly, Mr. R. G. White, who would banish the verb *experience* from our language, gives the advice: "Let us not *experience* either a hay-crop, or a cow, or *anything else*." Against use there is no conclusion from abuse.

Sober instances of the cleft infinitive, those, in kind, which are rapidly recommending themselves to many persons of good taste, may be seen in the quotations drawn from Dr. Henry More, Sir Thomas Browne, and the other authors whose names are grouped together just above.

Adverting to what I had shortly before published relative to the form of collocation here considered, an open-minded writer in the London *Academy*, No. 533, liberally adjudicates that "to make hard-and-fast rules in such matters is absurd." This is exactly my opinion. At the same time, a suggestion to those who will not dispense with the cleft infinitive altogether, may not be amiss. It is, that they draw the line, when employing it, so as not to parallel, in uncouthness or heaviness, say the poet Wordsworth's *to not unfrequently make* and *to still further limit*.

It is "naïvely," according to Prof. Hill, that I make a certain remark which he quotes. Of a child one may speak thus inoffensively; but, otherwise, the word implies, I take it, a degree of weakness approaching imbecility. Where I decline to see more than a fact, my censor is positive that he sees what accounts for it, namely, heedlessness or what not, and would discredit me for my supposed want of common sense or perspicacity. One of the useful lessons which he has still to learn is, to put it suitably to his importance, to forbear, in some measure, that plerophory of cocksureness with which he habitually dogmatizes.

But, before concluding, I must thank him for a valuable illustration of the difference between the speech of England and that of the United States. In *Our English*, p. 121, he writes: "America *does not have* a monopoly of bad English." So one who talks loftily of what we are to expect from "writers who know their business." *Does not have!* If, in a village school over here, a bumpkin of ten were to express himself in this low, unidiomatic fashion, and be let off without stripes, he might think himself fortunate. Whoever *does not be* sure of this should come and inquire.

F. H.

MARLESFORD, ENGLAND, December 10, 1892.

P. S.—In my paper on the cleft infinitive above referred to, the quotation dated 1642 should be expunged. There, as was long the case occasionally, *to* stands for *too*.

And here I laid my letter aside, until I could satisfy myself regarding the paternity of the five quotations which I formerly gave as from Dr. Donne. Him I now find that I should not have named in connexion with them, but John Done, possibly a pseudonym: at any rate, nothing is known of any person so called. For this information I am indebted to the courtesy of the Rev. Dr. Augustus Jessopp, Rector of Scarning, the learned writer of the Life of Donne in the *Dictionary of National Biography*.

While waiting to finish this postscript, I have read Mr. Albert Matthews's letter on the cleft infinitive in No. 1438 of your journal. As to Mr. Matthews's remark that none of the quotations which I first gave for the cleft infinitive are from American authors, I reply that, in 1882, I had by me, for it, from such writers, more than five times the number of his quotations from all sources, and, besides, many from Scotch writers, as Carlyle, etc., etc., but purposely passed them by. Except when dealing with dialect, I almost always restrict myself to the authority of Englishmen. To see that Mr. Matthews's quotations from Shakespeare, Washington, Keats's *Cap and Bells*, and Dr. Holmes's *Guardian Angel* are not at all in point, requires only a little study.

FEBRUARY 25, 1893.

Notes.

A NEW edition of their 'Pronouncing Gazetteer of the World' is announced for this year by J. B. Lippincott Co.

Houghton, Mifflin & Co. have in press a Life of Ruskin, in two volumes, by W. G. Collingwood.

Lowell's Letters, as edited by Prof. Norton, will fill two volumes. The Harpers will publish them, as well as the second volume of the illustrated edition of Green's 'Short History of the English People,' 'Botany as a Recreation,' by Caroline A. Creevey, 'Practical Lawn Tennis,' by Dr. James Dwight, and 'The Philosophy of Singing,' by Mrs. Clara K. Rogers.

Dr. Edward Everett Hale's 'A New England Boyhood' will be published, with illustrations by his son, by Cassell.

The Scribners announce 'Social Strugglers,' a novel by Prof. H. H. Boyesen.

D. Lothrop Co. will issue next month 'In the Wake of Columbus: The Adventures and Researches of a Columbian Commissioner following in the Track of the Great Admiral from Cordova,' by Frederick A. Ober. The work will be copiously illustrated.

The Baker & Taylor Co. promise a reprint, 'Greeley on Lincoln,' which is of itself worthy of a place beside Mr. Schurz's sketch; but the little volume, edited by Joel Benton, will also contain letters from Mr. Greeley to Charles A. Dana and a lady friend, and reminiscences of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the *Tribune's* founder. The same firm have in preparation 'The New Era,' by the Rev. Josiah Strong, and 'Amateur Photography,' by W. I. Lincoln Adams.

'The Confessions of a Convict,' edited by Julian Hawthorne, with illustrations by the criminal himself (a forger) and others, will be published by Rufus C. Hartranft, Philadelphia.

Knight, Leonard & Co., Chicago, have nearly ready 'Napoleon: A Drama,' illustrated from historic paintings, by Richard Sheffield Dement.

'Old English Ballads,' selected and edited, with notes and an introduction, by Prof. F. B. Gummere of Haverford College, is in the press of Ginn & Co.

A. C. McClurg & Co., Chicago, will add to their "Great French Writers" 'Bernardin de St. Pierre,' from the French of Arvède Barine; and to their "Elizabethan Library" 'A Bower of Delights,' interwoven verse and prose from the works of Nicholas Breton, and 'Selections from the Works of Lord Bacon.'

Mr. William C. Bamburgh, Plainfield, N. J., expects to be his own publisher for a volume, 'The Echo and the Poet, and Other Poems,' to appear about April 25 in a limited edition.

Ward, Lock, Bowden & Co. will bring out directly a new edition of George Borrow's 'Lavengro,' with an introduction and personal reminiscences by Theodore Watts. It will form part of the "Minerva Library."

'Many Inventions' (not "Intentions") appears to be the true title of Rudyard Kipling's new book to be published here by D. Appleton & Co., who also announce 'Wanderings by Southern Waters,' by Edward Harrison Barker.

During the present year T. Fisher Unwin, London, will publish the Autobiography of Theobald Wolfe Tone, edited by R. B. O'Brien, with a preface by Mr. Bryce and illustrations; 'Lord Tennyson and His Friends,' a series of twenty-five portraits in photogravure by Mr. and Mrs. Cameron, forming an *édition de luxe;* 'Napoleon at Elba and St. Helena,' an illustrated narrative by eye-witnesses; a translation of M. Tenger's 'Recollections of the Countess Theresa of Brunswick'; 'The Doge's Farm,' by Miss Margaret Symonds, with illustrations; 'The Tragedy of the Norse Gods,' by Mrs. Ruth Pitt; 'Old-World Scotland,' by T. F. Henderson; 'The Australian Commonwealth,' by G. Tregarthen; 'Greek Vase Painting,' by Miss Jane E. Harrison and D. S. MacColl, with fifty full-page plates; 'Stories from Garshine,' translated by Mrs. Alice Voynich; a new edition of 'The Best Plays of Christopher Marlowe,' edited by Havelock Ellis; a new "Reformers' Library," including 'The English Peasant,' by Richard Heath, and 'The Life of Samuel Bamford'; and a "New Irish Library," beginning with 'The Patriot Parliament of 1689,' by Thomas Davis.

Chapman's translation of the 'Iliad' fills three volumes of the dainty Nuggets Series of the Messrs. Putnam, and, being a companionable book for the pocket, has been well chosen for this series.

The sight of Walton's 'Complete Angler,' edited by Edward Gilpin Johnson (Chicago: A. C. McClurg & Co.), encourages us to hope that the time may come soon when Chicago will not mark the Western limit of Waltonian editions, as there is no surer sign of the extension of literary taste to any region than the appearance in it of a new edition of this pastoral classic. The book under notice is not a reprint of the first edition, which was greatly enlarged in the second issue published in 1655; nor does it contain the second part by Cotton, which is included in most of the other editions. Mr. Johnson, in his introduction, speaks of Cotton's part as being "Walton, in short, minus what is peculiarly Walton—salt without its savor." The justness of this criticism is hardly borne out, we think, by the verdict of two centuries on the question. The introduction shows a good appreciation of the fine character of Walton and the remarkable literary charm of the 'Angler.' Such a great number of introductions to the various editions have been contributed, and so many of them by able hands, that scarcely anything remains to be said, while at the same time there is the absolute necessity of saying something. The size of the book (12mo) is desirable, and the few notes are so excellent as to make the reader wish them more abundant.

To the two sets of pretty books known as the "Collection Guillaume"—one containing the original edition of M. Daudet's 'Tartarin sur les Alpes,' and the other containing most of M. Daudet's novels illustrated with the same fantasy and skill—is now added a third series to be known as the "Petite Collection Guillaume" and to be illustrated like its elder brothers. The volumes are even tinier than the pretty little books in Harper's "Black and White" series. They are intended to appear twice a month and to comprise most of the little classics of the world's literature. Indeed, the editor has a truly cosmopolitan taste, for among the first volumes to appear are the German 'Werther,' the French 'Paul and Virginia,' the British 'Corsair' (of Byron), and the American 'Gold Bug' (known by the British as the "Gold Beetle" and here magnificently transformed into the "Scarabée d'Or"). Among the promised volumes are Turgeneff's 'Spring Floods,' Ibsen's 'Ghosts,' Silvio Pellico's 'My Prisons,' the 'Golden Ass' of Apuleius, the 'Daphnis and Chloe' of Longus, the 'Fables' and the 'Contes' of La Fontaine.

Prof. Charles F. Kroeh of the Stevens Institute of Technology, at Hoboken, N. J., has published a little book on 'How to Think in French.' The plan he recommends, although tried before, is very good; it is, in the main, to say to one's self, in French, what one happens to be doing at the time. Given a sufficient amount of perseverance on the part of the learner—and the lack of it is the greatest obstacle—the book will certainly enable him to make considerable progress.

The little pamphlet, 'Notes on the Teaching of French,' by Prof. F. C. de Sumichrast of Harvard (Boston: D. C. Heath & Co.), will well repay the instructor who reads and masters it. It is sensible throughout, and contains useful hints for students who cannot enjoy the privilege of a teacher.

The Harvard report on English is the subject of a brief comment by Mr. Samuel Thurber, Principal of the Girls' High School, Boston, in the April number of the *Educational Review* (Henry Holt & Co.). Mr. Thurber impugns the validity of the facsimiles as evidence —*i. e.*, he regards the time and place of writing the originals, and the probable disparagement of the secondary schools to which the Harvard freshmen had been accustomed during their first year at college, and concludes that "the freak element is discernible in some of these papers," and that the writers wrote what would be pleasing to their new instructors. Mr. Thurber fears the dissemination of the report may lead to "the sudden and inconsiderate adoption of useless books relating to composition and rhetoric."

The acquisition of the late George Bancroft's library for the Lenox Library of this city after the Government had declined an offer at a lower figure, gives special force to a paper read before the American Historical Association in 1891 by Prof. J. F. Jameson of Brown University, and published last year by the Government Printing Office, on "The Expenditures of Foreign Governments on behalf of History." This paper was designed, in fact, to support by definite statistics the contention that "the American Government may properly be expected to do more in behalf of history than it has hitherto done." As the result of much difficult research, it shows that at present our Government compares with the foremost in total amount of expenditure, but is open to criticism for the narrowness of the field cultivated, when so much historical matter of the first importance entreats publication, and for the want of a permanent system or commission to that end.

The seventh annual report of the Reynolds Library of Rochester, N. Y., is remarkable for its minute exhibition of the plans of the trustees for developing the collection with strict reference to its environment—first, by avoiding duplication of the lines of other public libraries in that university city, and then by adjusting its resources in books and in rooms to the needs of a great variety of classes in the community, into whose life the Library will thus be made to enter most intimately and congenially.

We read in the seventeenth report of the trustees of the Boston Museum of Fine Arts that it has come into possession of two large solar prints of the 'Alexander" sarcophagus at Constantinople, showing two sides on a scale approaching that of the original, and permitting them to be studied as favorably as casts.

We take pleasure in calling the attention of librarians and students to the publication, just begun, of Prof. Lanciani's great archæological map of Rome, which promises to be the standard authority on the topography of the city for a long period. Prof. Lanciani has been occupied with the preparation of this map almost uninterruptedly for twenty-five years, and it is as offshoots from this labor that his numerous essays have appeared. He has published about three hundred papers on topics arising from the subject, and the erudition and observation of which these give evidence have been devoted primarily to this *magnum opus*. The map is to be published by the Reale Accademia dei Lincei, through Hoepli of Milan, and will be on a scale of 1:1000, divided into 46 sheets, each measuring 60x90 cm. It will be printed in five colors, by means of which the student will see at a glance the epoch to which any monument belongs. The publishers promise that not less than six sheets shall be published annually, beginning with a first instalment of six sheets at present. In the prospectus we have received, the price of the completed work is stated at eight pounds sterling, in annual payments of one pound, or with a discount of 10 per cent. to those who pay the whole amount at once.

We have received the first number of the *Sierra Club Bulletin*, which is to our Pacific Coast what *Appalachia* is to our Atlantic. It contains a map, two mountain views, three papers—"The Mt. Whitney Trail," by Hubert Dyer, "The Grand Cañon of the Tuolumne," by R. M. Price, and a "Description of a New Grove of Sequoia Gigantea," by W. W. Price —and the Proceedings of the Club, a San Francisco organization. The *Bulletin* is sold at twenty-five cents by the Secretary.

The March number of the *Vierteljahrschrift für Litteraturgeschichte* contains an interest-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing study of Goethe's fragment 'Elpenor,' by Prof. Henry Wood of Johns Hopkins, a German translation of a paper of his which appeared in vol. 12 of the *American Journal of Philology*. Prof. Wood puts 'Elpenor' in the same category with 'Die Geschwister,' 'Iphigenie,' and 'Wilhelm Meister,' as reflecting problems and conflicts born out of Goethe's relation to Frau von Stein. Antiope, Elpenor's mother, has some traits of character which may have been suggested by Frau von Stein herself. Lykus, Elpenor's guardian, performs at least in part the rôle which Goethe maintained towards Fritz, the son of Frau von Stein. The central conception of the drama—the inner purification and final union of characters that had been estranged from each other through guilt and misunderstanding—finds its counterpart in many of Goethe's inner experiences during the first ten years of his Weimar life. So much, it seems, must be conceded to Prof. Wood. His conjectures about the way in which the solution of the conflict was to be brought about are, if not conclusive, at least very ingenious.

Some of our English cousins who are constantly occupied in organizing new "levelling up" agencies, have lately set in motion a sort of Annex to the University Extension movement, that opens a congenial field of work for educated English women, and suggests the possibility of a similar propaganda of culture among the countless rural centres of our own land, and the utilization of much unappropriated feminine capacity. The Association of Women Pioneer Lecturers provides lectures by women (who have passed examinations stringent enough to guarantee their efficiency) in districts not yet touched by the University Extension scheme or any other similar teaching. The lectures are on such subjects as literature, art, history, science, economics, etc., the object being to offer the means of a higher education than can be obtained at elementary schools by the average self-supporting man or woman, such as "dwellers in rural localities, ladies resident in suburban districts, the members of workingmen's and women's clubs, institutes, and night schools." At present the Association sends out thirty lecturers—many of whom have had University training—from their four centres of work, Hayward's Heath, Enfield, about ten miles from London, Luton, among the Chiltern Hills, and Chelmsford, the county seat of Essex.

The latest sign of the growth of English public feeling in regard to the extension of the Parliamentary franchise to women rate-payers was the presentation by Viscount Wolmer, in the House of Commons, on March 10, of a petition signed exclusively by members (634) of County Councils, from many different parts of England; the signatures from Northumberland numbering 67, out of a total of 80 County Councillors. The petition ran as follows: "The undersigned members of County Councils, having had experience of the effects of women's suffrage in County Council elections, consider that their enfranchisement has been of advantage to the community, and that the extension of the right to vote in Parliamentary elections to the same women would similarly be attended with beneficial results. Your petitioners, therefore, pray that your Honourable House will pass a measure to extend the Parliamentary franchise to such women." A correspondent writes that delayed signatures continue to come in to add emphasis to this comparatively novel endorsement of the old adage, "That the proof of the pudding is in the eating."

—The current number of the *New England Magazine* contains an interesting retrospective view of the increasingly serious domestic problem. Those who are inclined to agree with the writer, Prof. Lucy M. Salmon, that "any attempt made to secure a change for the better in the present condition of domestic service must meet with failure if it does not take into consideration its historical aspects," will find in her article an ample exposition of the different systems of service that have prevailed in this country, from the unsophisticated period when Samuel Breck at Philadelphia boarded the ship *John* from Amsterdam and purchased two French Swiss—one, a woman, for her passage-money, with a promise of $20 ("clothing and maintenance of course") at the end of three years, "if she serves me faithfully"; the other, a boy, on similarly primitive terms, with "six weeks' schooling each year" for two years—to the present era of crowded high schools and depopulated kitchens. Some statistics quoted to illustrate the present lack of stability in domestic labor point a timely moral. Of the nearly 700 servants questioned as to whether they had ever been engaged in any other occupation, 27 per cent. replied in the affirmative, while 68 per cent. did not live in their native State and country. This statement does not take into account the number of times the 700 have, in all probability, under the present system of "French leave" of an employer, changed situations. It remains to be seen how long the women of a new educational era will submit to conditions in the household that would not be tolerated in any well-ordered office where type-writers, stenographers, or female clerks of any description are employed. One of the "historical aspects of domestic service," the respect it formerly commanded, will without doubt have to be revived in the future. This can be done only by elevating housework to an industrial plane that is worthy of respect.

—Necrology must needs form a constant part of any record of a large body of alumni, and, in the case of Harvard and her *Graduates' Magazine*, not infrequently the dead will be eminent in a high degree. The April number, for instance, commemorates the late Phillips Brooks by a portrait by Kruell and an estimate by Prof. C. C. Everett, who analyzes his gifts as a preacher. Dr. Peabody's death could barely be mentioned in this number. Mr. C. J. Bonaparte has a too brief and indeterminate paper on a use for certain of the college societies in making good the loss of the old "class feeling" consequent upon the adoption of the elective system and the great increase in the number of students. This discussion has a general bearing, and so has Prof. Moore's article on "The Study of the Fine Arts in Universities and Colleges." The English question comes to the fore again in a "symposium" of headmasters on secondary education, in which is to be remarked the great diversity of opinion. Mr. John P. Hopkinson points to "the increasing immaturity of boys of ten years of age—an increase very perceptible during the last twenty years." "The modern theories of education applied to very young children," he says, "perhaps strengthen their powers of observation, but without a corresponding exercise of the faculties of judgment and reflection. This seems to me true of kindergarten methods when continued beyond the very first stage of education." But chiefly Mr. Hopkinson blames the home-training for this immaturity. "One demoralizing influence is the habit of reading aloud to children," he thinks. All will agree with him when he says: "Formerly boys of ten had a good knowledge of all the countries, with their divisions, rivers, mountains, and chief cities; now they seldom know more than the United States, if even so much." There are many just and forcible remarks also in the paper by Mr. John S. White. In the capital summary of the university life for the quarter, noteworthy are the accounts of the Graduate Club, founded in 1889, and the more recent Prospect Union, which endeavors "to bring together college men and wage-earners in active sympathy and mutual helpfulness," and to become "a thoroughly recognized centre of university extension."

—A large Japanese vase awaited the winner in a prize contest lately instituted by the *Evening Courier* of Milan. The task was a translation of Tennyson's posthumous poem "The Silent Voices." No fewer than 604 persons of all ranks and callings in society, of both sexes, and of all degrees of familiarity with English, submitted 717 translations, paraphrases, amplifications, or one-line quintessences. The seven versions between which the choice lay were sole efforts and not alternative in any case. Blank verse would have been eligible for the prize, but the rhymed offerings proved the best. The last line of the poem,

> "On, and always on!"

gave much trouble, and so did the common idiom "beyond me" of the previous line,

> "Glimmering up the heights beyond me."

Both were made the subjects of foot-notes by numerous anxious competitors. The winner omitted "beyond me" and translated "on" by "up" (*in alto*), connecting it with "heights" rather than with "starry track," and failing altogether to convey the peculiarly Tennysonian flavor of the second line quoted above. Nevertheless his version was commendable, being as follows:

> "Quando l'ora silente in veste bruna
> Intorno al mio guanciale i sogni aduna,
> Deh! non mi richiamate,
> Mute voci dei morti,
> Sì spesso indietro, verso l'ima valle
> A cui volsi le spalle,
> Nè verso il sole che non dà più luce!
> Me chiamate pluttosto, o silenziose
> Voci, oltre il mondo, nell'etereo smalto
> Della stellata via
> Che in alto splende—in alto sempre! in alto!"

This proved to be from the pen of a prolific writer, in his seventieth year, the Lombard ex patriot, ex-opera-singer, ex-journalist, ex-novelist, ex-librettist, Antonio Ghislanzoni, "simpatico eremita di Caprino," as the *Courier* calls him in his leisured retirement.

—The eleventh volume of the Archives of Maryland, edited by Mr. William Hand Browne, covers the period from July 26, 1775, to July 6, 1776, in which the dependence of the province upon Great Britain was completely terminated. The editor characterizes what took place as "Maryland's transformation from a dependent Province to a sovereign State"; and again, "to an independent, self-governed State." Self-government had, in fact, set in before this volume opens, the Convention of county delegates which met at Annapolis on July 26, 1775, having first convened on June 22, 1774. This revolutionary act was one of independence so far as the mother country was concerned, but not absolutely and peremptorily. The Convention's permanent executive creation, the Council of Safety, whose proceedings fill the greater part of the volume, assured the royal Governor Eden at once that "Independence of G. Britain is not the Aim, or wish of the people of this Province," who acknowledged still a proper subordination and the authority of the laws of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Parliament when not oppressive. The Convention's delegates to the Congress at Philadelphia. originally maintained this attitude. On March 10, 1776, the Council was still hoping for a restoration of constitutional dependence on the mother country. All this time, too, the Governor, an amiable, much respected man, had been unmolested in the presence of this revolutionary body, and when he agreed not to quit the country without leave, the Council expressed its satisfaction, and wished again that a reconciliation might ensue. It refused to depose him, as Gen. Charles Lee of Virginia urged and got Congress to urge, on the ground that it would "dissolve the Government and subvert the Constitution," inasmuch as the Convention would have to be assembled to renew the expired commissions of the magistrates, sheriffs, and other officers "flowing from" the Governor. In his person it deliberately kept up "the ostensible form of our Chartered Constitution," and averted the "horrors of anarchy," until it should be convinced of the improbability of reconciliation. It accompanied him respectfully to the man-of-war which called for him towards the end of June, and when he had sailed, Maryland was wholly self-governing, but was implicated in a dependency on the other colonies incompatible with sovereignty. It is true that the Council had resented the interference of Congress on the one hand and of Gen. Lee on the other with Maryland's "internal Polity," as a State may do now in the Federal Union, while nevertheless "considering the Congress as having the supreme Authority over the Continent." But Lee's excuse, that "the safety or very being of the whole community appeared at stake"—meaning the "whole community" of the people of the several provinces—pointed to the only real sovereignty that had a chance of emerging from the struggle for independence.

—The proceedings of the Council of Safety are interesting if not enlivening reading. They are largely concerned with military organization, supplies, and defence. Tories were leniently dealt with as the times went, one being made to deposit £500 as his share of the defence of America, with a humorous stipulation to restore to him the unexpended balance after peace had been secured. For the engraving of currency, Franklin was resorted to. A few unconventional letters have slipped into the Archives, like that of John to Capt. Richard Chew, whose "mother has sent a boy with six blancoats," or like those from the sprightly pen of William to Gov. Bob Eden. Admirers of Mr. Richard Harding Davis's hero will be pleased, up and down these records, to meet numerous representatives of the Vanbebber family. We observe, too, that Thomas Edison figures on p. 526 as adjutant to Col. James Johnson's battalion for the five months previous to June 30, 1776. He should also, according to the index, appear on p. 543, but this seems to be an error for Thomas Ennalls. The innate propensity of slaves to be fugitives is shown in an entry of June 24, 1776, when a company was ordered to guard the shores "to prevent any servants or negroes or others from going on board the *Fowey* ship-of-war" along with Gov. Eden. The Governor obtained Capt. Montagu's assurance that he would take no runaway slaves, though he could not refuse to receive loyalists.

—The approach of another total eclipse of the sun on April 16 occasions renewed interest in these impressive phenomena. Its track strikes the South American Continent considerably north of Valparaiso; and near its beginning or western end are stationed Prof. Schaeberle of the Lick Observatory, Mr. Lawrence Rotch of Boston, and Prof. W. H. Pickering of the Harvard Observatory, occupying stations in Chili. To the northeast, in Argentina, two expeditions will watch for the darkening of the sun, the one in charge of M. Beuf, Director of the Observatory of La Plata, and the other under Prof. Thome, Director of the National Observatory at Cordoba. Still further northeast, and near Ceará, in the Brazilian region where the path of totality leaves the American Continent, not only is there a company of Brazilian observers trained by M. Cruls, Director of the Observatory at Rio de Janeiro, but the French astronomers have also a well-equipped expedition to this locality, near Para Curú, and the English also one, in charge of Mr. A. Taylor, who served in like capacity in West Africa during the second eclipse of 1889. As Ceará is not in the line of regular steamship communication, a man-of-war of the Brazilian Navy has been placed at the disposal of the observers, who may need transport from Rio. On crossing the Atlantic Ocean to North Africa, in the region of Bathurst and Senegal, the moon's shadow will be met by still other expeditions, two under French auspices, MM. Bigourdan and Deslandres of the Paris Observatory situate at Joal, and M. de la Baume Pluvinel in another. In a third region of the African belt, and at Fundium, a short distance up the Salum River, Prof. Thorpe will lead an English expedition, with apparatus entirely similar to that which Mr. Taylor will employ on the Brazilian coast. Rapid variations in coronal light and streamers may thus be detected. But, in addition to this, the other problems presented by the corona will not be neglected, and the customary observations will be made with spectroscope and photometer at several places along the line.

—The conditions of cloudiness or otherwise at all these stations have been under investigation by Prof. David P. Todd for the last three years, in order to enable the selection of the best observing sites. In a late number of the *American Meteorological Journal*, he presents the first investigation of this kind ever made, and with as near approach to comprehensiveness as the limited time since the African expedition would permit. The aim was to secure, so far as possible, cloud observations at or near all advantageous observing points, throughout the month of April, 1890, 1891, and 1892, at or near the particular time of day when the eclipse is to take place at each station. At some regions it has, of course, been impossible to do this; for these the best available data are presented. That this eclipse is unusual in point of totality-duration is apparent on reference to 'The American Ephemeris.' In Chili the central-line duration is 2m. 56s., Argentina 3m. 5s., on the east coast of Brazil 4m. 40s., and in Senegal, on the west coast of Africa, 4m. 10s. The result of the whole inquiry is that the Desert of Atacama, Chili, is by far the best station if clear skies alone are to be regarded. On passing to the east of the Andes, the meteorological conditions are rather less favorable, even on the great mountain elevations which lie in the path of totality. Still further to the northeast, and in the very accessible region of Tucuman, reached by rail from Buenos Ayres, the chances of a cloudy sky approach the maximum. Coming next to northeastern Brazil, in the neighborhood of Ceará, a locality easy to reach, and with all the astronomical conditions most favorable (the sun being near the zenith and the total eclipse approaching five minutes in duration), clouds are unfortunately next to certain. In Africa the chances are greatly improved, and the eclipse is likely to be seen in cloudless skies, though the indications regarding haze (a great foe to observations of the corona) are not comforting.

AN HISTORIAN'S FACTS.

Division and Reunion, 1829–1889. By Woodrow Wilson, Ph.D., LL.D. With five maps. Longmans, Green & Co. 1893. [Epochs of American History.]

WE have here what the author calls "a sketch in broad outline—not so much a compact narrative as a rapid synopsis—of the larger features of public affairs in the crowded space of sixty years that stretches from the election of Andrew Jackson to the end of the first century of the Constitution." As might be expected from the learning and literary skill of the writer, he holds his subject well in hand, and, after a liberal allowance made for his point of view, he divides what seems to him the word of truth with a candor and a discrimination that are worthy of praise. In reviewing a period of "misunderstanding and of passion" he does not claim to have judged rightly in all cases as between parties. He claims only to have practised that impartiality of judgment which is a matter of the heart. This latter claim may be frankly conceded by those who feel constrained to dissent, as we do, from many of his historical appreciations. Where impartiality of judgment was difficult, he often holds the scales of justice with a steady hand. Where impartiality of judgment was easy, he seems to us to have sometimes been much less happy in summing up the judicial verdicts of history; and this because his point of view, as we conceive, sometimes subjects his observations to a species of obvious historical parallax, only the more misleading for being entirely unconscious. There must necessarily be a large angular variation in the position of events in American history, according as they are viewed from the South Carolina theory of the Constitution or the theory expounded by Madison and Webster. Mr. Wilson holds that the South Carolina theory of the Constitution was the only true theory, because it was the original theory that dated from the formation of the instrument.

The editor of this series informs us, we presume by way of explanation, that each author of the successive volumes "has kept his own point of view, and no pains have been taken to harmonize divergencies of judgment." This course undoubtedly has its advantages, and guarantees to each author that intellectual integrity which it is his right to assert and maintain, but it is a course which may easily lend itself to much confusion of ideas so far as the average reader is concerned. In a synopsis like this he naturally looks for some similarity of historical perspective where the larger features of our public affairs are delineated.

To such a reader it may easily seem that the *Proteus historicorum* has slightly abused his privileges when Mr. Wilson is allowed to teach in this volume that we must wholly discard the constitutional theory which Prof. Hart inculcated in the preceding volume of the series. Prof. Hart had told us, what we were quite ready to believe for reasons other than he gives, that the Constitution, at the time of its formation, was understood to be not a mere

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

compact, but a permanent instrument of government for the whole people. He affirmed that the defects of the Confederation "had educated the American people to the point where they were willing to accept a permanent federal union." A nation without a national government seemed to him, as to the authors of the 'Federalist,' "an awful spectacle."

Mr. Wilson assumes in the volume before us that this whole *manière de voir* is entirely unhistorical and false. Mr. Hart had told us that a clear statement of the "compact" theory of government was put forward for the first time in the Kentucky and Virginia "Resolutions of '98." Mr. Wilson, on the contrary, holds that the "compact" theory was congenital with the Constitution, and that the famous reply of Webster to Hayne struck the chords of national sympathy with might in 1830, only because "the North was now beginning to insist on a national government," whereas the South, he adds, "was continuing to insist on the original understanding of the Constitution: that was all." He asserts that "it was for long found difficult to deny that a State could withdraw from the Federal arrangement, as she might have declined to enter it"; that Webster's epoch-marking speech, considered as an interpretation of the Constitution, "had been a prophecy rather than a statement of accomplished fact"; that it is because the Constitution was "the skeleton frame of a living organism" that the course of events in that organism came in the end "to nationalize the government once deemed confederate"; that while this process of change was going on in the social tissue and economic forces of both the North and the West, the South "had stood still," and, "standing still, she retained the old principles which had once been universal." And these, we are told, "are not lawyer's facts: they are historian's facts."

Our readers are well aware that at this late date in our annals we resolutely decline to discuss "lawyer's facts" concerning the true intendment of the Constitution, as ascertained by "construction construed" in the matter at issue. Not that we are quite prepared to say, with John Taylor of Caroline, that when "construction" gives right answers, "it ought to be laughed at for playing the fool," and that when it gives wrong answers, "it ought to be suspected of playing the knave." This compendious contempt of the Virginian exegete seems a little too insulting to deductive logic considered as an organon of discussion. It is enough for us that there is no end to the mere processes of legal dialectic, and that a few cold facts of history are often conclusive against a logomachy which has embroiled whole generations of men.

It is no more certain, it seems to us, that the Constitution was adopted than that it was adopted as the bond of a permanent Union. The idea that the Constitution could be adopted with a reservation of the right to withdraw from the Union, in case certain amendments were not secured, appears to have been started in the Massachusetts Convention of 1788, but it was speedily abandoned. The same idea was championed by a powerful minority in the Virginia Convention, but was formally voted down. Alexander Hamilton, in his despair of securing a majority for the pure and simple ratification of the Constitution by the New York Convention, wrote to ask Madison in 1788 if a State could ratify the instrument conditionally on the adoption of certain amendments, and therefore with a reserved right to withdraw in case those amendments were not adopted. Madison, as we all know, replied that "a conditional ratification did not make a State a member of the Union"; that "the Constitution required an adoption *in toto* and for ever"; and that "it had been so adopted by the other States." Notwithstanding this explicit statement of Madison, a whole host of amendments, some conditional, some explanatory, and some recommendatory, were submitted to the New York Convention for discussion in its Committee of the Whole, but all conditional amendments, and the words "on condition" in the form of the ratification, were rejected. The Convention then resolved unanimously that a circular-letter should be sent to all the States as expressive of the views of New York. That circular-letter contains the following passage: "Our attachment to our sister States, and the confidence we repose in them, cannot be more forcibly demonstrated than by acceding to a government which many of us think very imperfect, *and devolving the power of determining whether that government shall be rendered perpetual in its present form*, or altered agreeably to our wishes and a minority of the States with whom we unite."

These "historian's facts" (we apologize to our readers for rehearsing them) would seem to be tolerably conclusive, unless they can be traversed by some "historian's facts" equally clear in an opposite direction and of even date with them. We have not been able to find any such, and, until they are pointed out, we purpose to persist in our repugnance to "lawyer's facts," whether based on the "Resolutions of '98," the South Carolina "Exposition" of 1828, the Nullification Ordinance of 1832, or the Secession Ordinance of 1860.

Coming to matters of opinion, we venture to express the conviction that Mr. Wilson has looked at his "historian's facts" through the wrong end of the telescope, and so has fallen into an inversion of ideas when he argues that it was the growing power and the altered social tissue of the North and the West which incubated and energized at the North and at the West a sense of nationalism never quickened at the South, because "the South had stood still while the rest of the country had undergone profound changes," and, standing still, had retained, as Mr. Wilson says, "the old principles which had once been universal." It would have been better to say that it was the waning power and social insulation of the South which incited her to invent and to energize in the interest of slavery the whole latter-day theory of "Separate State Sovereignty." It is undoubtedly true that in the course of events the South was left in a painful state of political and economic isolation by reason of her adherence to slavery—the "peculiar institution" which generated in the bosom of Southern society the fact and the sense of "separateness" to which the author refers again and again. But so far is it from being true that there had been "nothing active on the part of the South" in sectionalizing the Union, it would rather seem more correct to say that she had the larger share in this process. "A mild anti-slavery sentiment, born of the philanthropic spirit, had existed in all parts of the country from the first," says Mr. Wilson. Elsewhere he comments on the effect of slavery in generating "a stubborn pride of class privilege, and a watchful jealousy of interference from any quarter, either with that privilege itself, or with any part of the life which environs and supports it." He shows how slavery, after the invention of the cotton-gin, came to seem "nothing less than the indispensable economic instrument of Southern society." He shows how the South "grew more and more self-conscious as the anti-slavery agitation proceeded" at the North; and that this self-consciousness acted both as cause and as effect, he admits when he says that the ruling class at the South had "more political power, and clearer notions of how it meant to use that power, than any other class in the country."

Now, it is to be observed, we think, that in proportion as this feeling of "separateness" from other sections of the country grew more and more intense at the South; in proportion as "its sense of dependence for the preservation of its character upon a single fateful institution grew more and more keen and apprehensive" (these words are Mr. Wilson's), precisely in that proportion did the Southern politicians proceed to generate novel pseudo-theories of constitutional construction, by way of a State-rights prophylaxis for the defence of their "peculiar institution." Hence their successive shifts in manœuvring for a defensive position according to the South Carolina tactics: first, that a State may provisionally nullify an act of Congress till its constitutionality shall be affirmed by three-fourths of the States; then, that each State may separately and alone nullify an act of Congress, in the exercise of its separate reserved rights; then, the theory of nullification as rendered express and organic in Calhoun's scheme of a Dual Executive, with a veto power vested in each head for the mutual countercheck of all legislation deemed by either inimical to the respective sections comprised in the political equilibrium; and, finally, the theory of separate State secession which was reduced to practice in 1860 and 1861. To speak of the South as "standing still" on such a *glissade*, or to speak of the South as having retained "the old principles which had once been universal," is to baffle criticism by dealing in contradictions which are self-destructive.

The style of Mr. Wilson's narrative, though sometimes careless, is always easy and flowing, but occasionally there are strange slips of the historian's pen, as when we read that Delaware cast eight electoral votes for Fillmore in the Presidential election of 1856, where of course Maryland was meant.

LINTON'S EUROPEAN REPUBLICANS.

European Republicans: Recollections of Mazzini and his Friends. By W. J. Linton. London: Lawrence & Bullen. 1892.

We welcome this book; it is sincere; it deals with memorable men and important events. If it did no more than bring to the attention of a new generation the personality of Joseph Mazzini, it would do much; but it must inevitably do more than that—it must remind older readers and inform new ones of that great movement towards republicanism in Europe which, beginning in 1789, and seeming about to prevail in 1848, still goes on, despite many checks, though less boisterously than of yore. Of that movement Mazzini was, as all now can plainly see, the incomparable leader for well-nigh forty years; but in saying this we by no means imply that many of his fellow-republicans are not worthy of admiration. Every oppressed people has had its especial heroes and guides: it is Mazzini's distinction that he, while working most ardently for Italy, was recognized as the Cosmopolitan Conspirator. While Herzen represented Russia and Worcell Poland, while Kossuth stood for Hungary's national aims, and Ledru Rollin, or Victor Hugo, or Louis Blanc represented the irreconcilable republi-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cans of France, Mazzini was the confidant of them all.

In the comparatively brief span between the present and the days when Mazzini and his friends were actively propagating their principles, time has in large measure justified them. There is not a country in Europe whose political condition has not advanced along the line they laid down. The verdict of history has already pronounced for Hugo and Ledru Rollin, and against the refined villain who consented to and profited by the massacre of December 2, 1851. The abominations of Papal misrule have been swept away. No apologist has ever arisen to whitewash the memory of King Bomba of Naples. Hungary, though not yet independent of Austria, has a recognized national existence. Austria herself is governed constitutionally. Germany is still despotic, but no longer in the irritating, petty way of fifty years ago. Russia has freed her serfs. Even in Spain and Turkey there is more intelligence, which must be the forerunner of political progress. How much the republican advocates of Europe have contributed to bring to pass these changes can never be computed, but without question their influence has been enormous. That they should have been proscribed and persecuted for advocating such patent benefits would astonish us, did we not know that from the dawn of history down to the present time mankind have greeted their benefactors with derision, and, failing by derision to silence them, by imprisonment, exile, or death.

The doctrines preached by Mazzini, Lamennais, and their friends could be satisfied by no partial reform, no makeshift, no compromise; their fulfilment presupposes the complete remodelling of society. Stated briefly, Mazzini held that the French Revolution marked the end of an epoch in the development of the human race—the epoch of arbitrary authority in religion and in government. Men no longer believed in the divine right of kings, nor in the supernatural origin and continued sanction of the Church; nevertheless, they did not cease to uphold the old monarchical and ecclesiastical symbols. As an inevitable result, society was half-hearted, inconsistent, insincere, proclaiming on the one hand the rights of man and civic and legal equality, while maintaining, on the other hand, a monarchical government and a State Church. Democracy was everywhere transforming the old régime—except on the surface: there, titles, offices, and privileges seemed immutably attached to one class. Europe being thus organized on a sham, it was the duty of every honest man to hasten her reorganization on a reality, to secure for her a government which should as faithfully represent her modern ideals as feudalism in its purity represented mediæval ideals. The new government must, in a word, be a republic.

But the republic which Mazzini had in mind was not at all like that form of so-called republican government of which France had given an example. France, he reiterated, set up the Rights of Man, and made individualism, egotism, her model; the true gospel will preach the Duties of Man. Hitherto, individualism has been the highest product of political systems; in the new era, of which the nineteenth century is the threshold, association will be the prevailing principle, and the People, that is, all the members of the State, shall have common privileges, in contrast to the past, in which only a fragment of the State, a special class of nobles or clergy, or an individual monarch, has been supreme at the expense of all the other classes. Nevertheless, Mazzini's reforms did not stop here; to him, the civic or political life could not be divorced from the moral life. Our republican party, he said, is essentially religious. To discover and promulgate religious truths which should take the place of decaying dogmas was the deepest purpose of his life. As early as 1832 he summed up, in the following noteworthy paragraphs, tenets which he held to the end of his life:

"Catholicism is extinct; but you who watch over its bier remember that Catholicism is only a sect, an erroneous application, the *materialism* of Christianity. Remember that Christianity is a revelation and a statement of *principles*, of certain relations of man with that which is beyond himself, which were unknown to paganism. . . . Remember, in short, that a religious principle has always presided over two-thirds of the revolutions of single peoples, and all the great revolutions of humanity; and that to desire to abolish it where you have no other to substitute, where there is neither education, nor any profound conviction of general duties, nor a uniform conscience, nor the habit of high social virtue, is the same thing as to create a void, to open an abyss, which you yourselves will perhaps be the first to fill.

"Perhaps in religion, as in politics, the age of the *symbol* is passing away, and a solemn manifestation may be approaching of the Idea as yet hidden in that symbol. Perhaps the discovery of a new relation—that of the individual to humanity—may lay the foundation of a new religious bond, as the relation of the individual with nature was the soul of paganism; as the relation of the individual with God has been the soul of Christianity. But whatever may be in store for the future, whatever new revelation of our destinies awaits us, it behooves us meanwhile not to forget that Christianity was the first to put forward the word *equality*, parent of liberty—that it was the first to deduce the rights of man from the inviolability of his human nature—that it was the first to open a path to the relationship of the *individual* with *humanity*, containing in its doctrine of human *brotherhood* the germ of a principle, of a law of *association*."

We have wished, before passing to review Mr. Linton's book, to recall, even thus briefly, some of the cardinal principles of European republicanism, because at the present time the purposes of that movement are somewhat obscured by more purely economic questions. These principles, it will be seen, are not like those catch-vote planks of our contemporary political platforms, which are shouted for in October and repudiated or forgotten in December; they are convictions for which some of the noblest men of the century lived in exile or died on the scaffold—convictions rooted in the very nature of things, so far as those men could penetrate into it.

Mr. Linton's book serves a twofold purpose: it presents the doctrines of the leaders of European republicanism, and it outlines the careers of several typical republicans. This is a good method, because it enables us readily to compare words with deeds; and surely, criticise as we will the words, we cannot fail to admire the fortitude of Mr. Linton's heroes. "History pardons everything to those who know how to die," says Castelar; in this book another generation of readers can learn how young Ruffini and the Bandieras, how Pestel and Ryléieff and Konarski sealed their principles with their blood. Heroism like theirs transcends the heroism which is displayed in battle: they died for a cause which had not yet a recognized existence; they died as common outlaws. Particularly noteworthy is the immutable courage of the early Russian martyrs to liberty. The five leaders of the insurrection in December, 1825, were all hanged together. "But," says Linton, "the ropes broke or slipped with three of them, Ryléieff, Mouravieff, and Bestoujeff, who fell, breaking the scaffolding beneath them. Mouravieff was nearly dead, and had to be carried up; the other two coolly reascended the fatal ladder. Ryléieff merely observed that he had been exposed to a double agony; and Bestoujeff exclaimed: 'Nothing succeeds with me; even here I meet with disappointment.'" This remark deserves to be recorded along with that of Sir Thomas More to his executioner. Not less brave was Konarski, who was executed in midwinter. "They had left him in his summer clothes; and he asked to be allowed a warmer dress. 'My shivering limbs may tremble, and I would not seem to fear death,'" he said to his jailer.

But however interesting and touching are Mr. Linton's sketches of these too little known heroes, it is his accounts of Mazzini, Lamennais, and Herzen which possess the greatest value. Reading these sketches, we learn the principles which caused thousands of brave men to dare everything and to sacrifice everything. The account of Mazzini, which fills nearly half the volume, is largely compiled from his autobiography and political pamphlets. We need not warn the reader that Mr. Linton is partisan—that is so evident that the partisanship does no harm; indeed, the final worth of this book consists in the utter and uncompromising sincerity with which it states only one side of many of the debatable events in which Mazzini had a share. To Mr. Linton things were exactly as he describes them, they could not be different, and he cannot admit that any one else could honestly see them differently; so we who read are spared the tedium of argument and apology and evasion. We know what Mazzinians aspired to, we know what they did and what construction they put on the deeds of others. If each party would leave so frank a record, the task of the historian would be easier.

Much as we respect Mazzini's general doctrines, and highly as we revere his personal character, we cannot, for instance, admit that his policy of "action" in Italy after 1849 was either wise or calculated to further the cause which he cherished most. Nothing is clearer than that Italy had to be made independent and united before she could definitely choose her form of government. Unity was the first step, independence was the second; but Mazzini, from the moment when monarchical Piedmont began to be regarded as the exponent of the unifying principle, worked unceasingly to prevent the unification of Italy as a constitutional monarchy. The republic or nothing, was his motto. He persisted in creating all possible embarrassments for Victor Emanuel's Government, but from high motives. "For me the moral question is everything," he wrote to Daniel Stern in 1864. "It matters very little to me that Italy, a territory of so many square leagues, eats its corn or cabbages at a little cheaper price. It matters to me that Italy be great, good, moral, virtuous; it matters that she come to fulfil a mission in the world. But to-day our doctrinaires in 32mo inoculate the new-born babe with the conception of *opportunism*, of trimming, of lying, of baseness, of hypocrisy." To an idealist of this purity any tinge of compromise seemed pollution, and a statesman like Cavour little better than a sly rogue and a traitor. Yet had Cavour set himself to dream, he could doubtless have beheld as fair a vision, in which perfect citizens should administer perfect laws, as any other Utopian. The conflict between What-ought-to-be and What-can-be is eternal; while, therefore, we reverence those apostles of the former who chide our present imperfectness, let us not do injustice to the indomitable benefactors who

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have not disdained to grapple with the sordid Actual, and to reclaim it inch by inch.

Mr. Linton's sketch of Lamennais, more than half of which is a skilful condensation of Mazzini's article in the *Monthly Chronicle* for April, 1839, is surpassed in literary symmetry only by his brief account of Konarski. We have no space for criticising Lamennais, except to say that he seems to us the most notable French religious force of the century. Herzen, the Russian aristocrat, the exile, the publisher (in London) of the *Kolokol*—the first free Russian newspaper—the father of contemporary Nihilism, deserves more than passing mention, because he is but little known on this side of the Atlantic. Americans ought to know by what principles the chief assailants of Romanoff autocracy have been impelled, and this knowledge cannot be come at more easily than in Herzen's works. His faith in the destiny of his race, his belief that Russia need not pass through all the stages which other races have slowly passed through in order to arrive at civilization, his shrewd diagnosis of the gangrene of the Russian Church, his paradoxical enthusiasm for the Russian commune—these are matters full of interest, as is the narrative of his early career. Of Worcell, too—Stanislas Worcell, the Nestor of the Polish refugees, who would have been called "our best had there not been Mazzini to stand beside him"—much might be said, although he was not, like Mazzini, Lamennais, and Herzen, important as a thinker. His power lay in his character, which endured extremest destitution without a murmur, and combined great gentleness with an inflexible will. Stolzman, who starved rather than be a burden to his needy companions in exile, and Darasz, another Pole, complete the portraits which Mr. Linton has here sketched. Several of these sketches are amplified from an article contributed by him to the *Century* magazine eight years ago. All are vigorous, and those which refer to his personal friends are transfused with manly affection. Merely from the literary standpoint the style has rare distinction, being individual but not mannered, terse but nervous and alive.

The Realm of Music. By Louis C. Elson. Boston: New England Conservatory. Pp. 314.

MR. ELSON'S latest contribution to the literature of music combines entertainment with instruction in his usual pleasant manner. It is a collection of forty-one essays, of unequal length, that have appeared during the last ten years as editorial articles in the *Musical Herald* and other periodicals, and they are well worth preserving in book-form. The first essay, entitled "Reformers in Music," is really a luminous sketch, in forty pages, of the development of music, and it illustrates Mr. Elson's method, which is to take some special topic and consider it in its various bearings in the light of historic research and comparison. Thus, in "Law and Music" we have a discussion of legislative action on musical matters from the times of the ancient Egyptians and Greeks to the present day. The "Caste of the Musician" considers the great changes which have taken place in his social position. Haydn and Mozart were still treated like upper servants in Austria, and Weber suffered similarly in England. Beethoven asserted the musician's independence, but it remained for Liszt and Wagner to proclaim the royalty of genius. Pages 67 and 68 are an eloquent indictment of Germany for her treatment of the great composers. The royal composers have a chapter to themselves.

A few other titles may be cited to give an idea of the wide range of Mr. Elson's topics: "Wives of the Great Composers," "Composers at Play," "Old English Ballads," "The Legends of Music," "Music and Medicine," "Musicians' Fortunes," "Musical Novels," "Wagner and his Enemies," "The Size of the Modern Orchestra," "The Technique of Composition," etc. In all of these papers Mr. Elson exhibits his thorough knowledge of historic facts without making a pedantic parade of it. He is always entertaining, never obscure, even to lay readers. The only errors we have noticed are in the chapter on Wagner. It is not true that Wagner ever sneered at Liszt; he adored him as a man, and expressed great admiration of his compositions in a score of essays and letters. Nor is it true that the Paris "Tannhäuser" promised to be the greatest performance that the world had ever seen; on the contrary, Wagner's one consolation, as he himself tells us, at the brutal conduct of the Jockey Club, was that it prevented the Parisians from discovering the great shortcomings of that performance. Nor can we share the author's admiration for the sonata form, but agree rather with Wagner, who, in his essay on Beethoven (ix. 104), happily compares it to the "classical" French poetry, "in the soul-killing laws of which we find an eloquent analogy to the laws of construction of the operatic aria and the sonata." Mr. Elson should have added to his chapter on "The Rise of the Sonata" one on its Fall, somewhat in the vein of Dr. Parry, who, in a recent lecture, as summarized by the London *Musical Times*, made the following remarks:

"Before he [Beethoven] was fifty years old, Berlioz, Mendelssohn, Chopin, Schumann, Liszt, and Wagner had all arrived, whose very names suggested a different kind of art to that of Beethoven—a kind of art in which the sonata was neglected. Berlioz, with his impetuous striving after intense and definite expression, could scarcely be thought of in connection with sonatas. Chopin, it was true, wrote sonatas, but, inasmuch as they were sonatas, they were not Chopin, and when they were Chopin they were not sonatas. The field in which Schumann was truly characteristic was quite independent of sonata influence. Even Mendelssohn, the classicist, was least known by his sonatas; while Liszt deliberately attempted to replace the sonata type by programme music. In our own day Brahms had written a fine sonata and was great enough to do so again, but he was best known by 'Rhapsodies,' etc., and Dvorák, with his unsophisticated, half-savage spirit, was not a sonata-writer. This showed that the day of sonatas had passed; they were not the suitable type of the instrumental music of our age."

Etruscan Roman Remains in Popular Tradition. By Charles Godfrey Leland. Charles Scribner's Sons. 1892. 8vo, pp. viii, 385.

THE value of popular traditions as a witness to the earlier beliefs of a nation has been recognized but a few years, and already this new method of prehistoric investigation has been elevated into a science and its rules formulated in the work by Mr. G. L. Gomme ('Ethnology in Folklore') reviewed some time ago in this journal. Thus far the most brilliant applications of the method have been those made by Mannhardt and Frazer, who have been enabled by it to fill lacunæ and solve problems which had resisted every other method. Mr. Leland, well known for his researches in so many outlying fields of folk-lore, has attempted to apply this method to one of the most perplexing subjects of investigation, the beliefs of the ancient Etruscans. The difficulties of the method have been pointed out many times, and these difficulties are enormously increased in the present case by the complicated character of the subject. That Etruscan beliefs should have survived in the traditions of the modern Italian people is likely enough; but it is very difficult in a country like Italy, where the past still lives in tomb and ruin and museum, to be sure that any given modern tradition is of ancient origin. However, many such have undoubtedly survived, and only the other day traditions of Ovid, like Vergil transformed into a sorcerer, were collected at Sulmona.

The field from which, if we understand Mr. Leland aright, most of the traditions in the present volume have been collected is the Romagna Toscana, between Forlì and Ravenna, and quite outside of Etruria proper. This, however, Mr. Leland thinks of no consequence, "as the Etruscans at one time held all Italy, and it is very likely that they left in remote districts those traces of their culture to which this book refers." Among the people of this region the author has found a great mass of beliefs and customs which he refers partly to a survival of Etruscan and partly to a survival of Roman beliefs. The specific Etruscan element is not very large or very important—that is, it does not throw any new light on Etruscan beliefs, but simply shows that a well-known Etruscan divinity is still vaguely remembered by the people. Whether this tradition is a constant one or of modern origin it is impossible to say with certainty. For example, we know that the Etruscan Jupiter was denominated Tina or Tinia, and Mr. Leland's "witch authority," on being questioned, replied: "Tinia is the spirit of thunder and lightning and hail," and proceeded to give a charm to appease the god. It is interesting to note that the saint who, in Christian Italy, is supposed to protect against the lightning, Santa Barbara, shares this prerogative with Tinia in the district in question. In like manner Mr. Leland has found reminiscences of a large number of Etruscan deities, such as Téramó (Hermes), Turan (Venus), Flaflon (Bacchus), etc. These reminiscences are rarely unmixed with elements belonging to general folk-lore, as for instance in the case of Patána (Ceres), p. 230, who appears as the heroine of a well-known fairy tale.

Of less value but of greater interest is the second part of the work devoted to incantations, divination, medicine, and amulets. Here again it is impossible to say what belongs to specific Etruscan or Roman origin, or to what may be called universal folk-lore. Indeed, Mr. Leland gives many parallels from our own negro folk-lore. With all possible reservations, however, there still remains a large body of folk-lore which here appears for the first time, and which is peculiarly interesting as showing the survival of pagan beliefs in a country so thoroughly Christianized as is Italy. In all previous collections there has been comparatively little of this, and it reveals the existence of what may some day throw much light on the early beliefs of Italy. It is to be regretted that Mr. Leland has disfigured his work by the offensive tone he always assumes in speaking of the Christian religion. Such a tone is entirely out of place in a scientific work, and still more in a book intended for the general reader. We are sorry that we must add that there is something else but little less offensive than irreverence towards sacred things, and that is downright coarseness, not to say vulgarity, in many places.

Alcuin and the Rise of the Christian Schools. By Andrew Fleming West. Scribners. 1892.

THE story of Alcuin in the series of "Great Educators" is told by Prof. West in a little

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

volume of two hundred pages. The author has done his best with a material limited, to say the least, and in great part difficult to manage. There is no room for doubt that Alcuin was called to help in the revival of letters and of religious organization in general, which was unquestionably one of the objects most clearly before the mind of Charles the Great. He doubtless did some service in this direction, and left his mark upon his generation as the central figure in that phase of this revival which proceeded from the court. He wrote a few treatises on the subject of education, full of the curious jumble of ideas and tricks of dialectic skill which passed for learning in his day; but beyond this there is very little of solid ground on which to base a study of his influence.

Like most of his predecessors in the field, Mr. West has magnified his office, and given to the vague tradition about the man as much solidity as possible. He has taken up the very pretty picture of the "palace school" and invested it with as much life as it will bear. In fact, it is an open question whether this gathering of ladies and gentlemen was a school at all in any effective sense, and not rather something more nearly resembling a dilettante audience listening to popular lectures, with an occasional "quiz." Mr. West goes so far as to think of it as a sort of university, to which resort was had after the training of a cathedral school. He quotes a letter of Archbishop Leidrad of Lyons in support of this notion, but in the text of the letter itself, as published in the new edition of the 'Gallia Christiana,' there is no indication whatever of any such relation, and the statement of the Archbishop's own foundations is of the vaguest.

Again, we are told that Charlemagne introduced the idea of universal free education. This statement rests mainly upon an alleged capitulary of Charlemagne, quoted by the author from the old edition of Pertz, but, in the new edition of Boretius, distinctly declared to be the work of some private person of a later date. Even if it be genuine, the wording is such that it cannot be taken as proving that Charlemagne had any vision of universal education as we understand it. The gratuitous nature of instruction is inferred from a pastoral admonition of the Bishop of Orleans, addressed to the clergy of his diocese, and instructing them not to take any fees from their pupils except such as the parents might offer voluntarily. Now, the idea of regular payment for service rendered was almost unknown to the Middle Ages. All payments were thought of either as fulfilment of contract or as "benefits" in some form or other; so that this provision is not a very striking one, and will hardly bear the strain put upon it by the author. The conclusion that we find during the time of Charles the Great a regular working system of education in three pretty well defined stages, is, to say the least, bold. It would probably be nearer the truth to say that here, as elsewhere in the work of the great King, we have a very large programme which it was to take at least three hundred years to fill out.

We have called attention to these points because they are the heart of the book. In his estimate of Alcuin's personal character and the extent and accuracy of his learning, the author is on firmer ground and seems to have come to very judicious conclusions.

John G. Paton, Missionary to the New Hebrides. An Autobiography, edited by his brother. F. H. Revell Co. 2 vols., 8vo.

The Story of John G. Paton Told for Young Folks; or, Thirty Years among South Sea Cannibals. With forty-five illustrations. A. C. Armstrong & Son. 1892. 8vo, 397 pp.

It would be hard to find in missionary annals a story more full of mingled light and shadow, of thrilling incident, or of steadfast persistence in an apparently hopeless work, than this which Mr. Paton tells with such simple force. Born in the humble cottage of a Scotch weaver, his training was singularly well adapted to call into activity the qualities most essential to a pioneer missionary. In the poverty of his home he early learned to endure hardships, while his struggle for an education taught him perseverance, and his ten years' youthful labors as a city missionary in the slums of Glasgow gave him patience, tact, self-control, insight into character, and capacity to influence the lowest of men. His courage was doubtless born in him, though it was due in large measure, also, to his confident faith in the Divine protection, which naturally grew stronger with every new escape from death. The autobiography opens with a striking picture of his home and his God-fearing parents, descendants of the Covenanters, a brief sketch of his early life, and an interesting account of his successful work in Glasgow. In the remainder of the first part he describes his life on Tanna, one of the New Hebrides Islands in the Southern Pacific. The inhabitants were cannibals of the most savage and degraded type, and all his efforts to make an abiding impression upon them during three years and a half of uninterrupted labor were apparently fruitless. His life from the first was constantly in danger, but at length the natives were so infuriated by the wanton introduction among them of the measles by the white traders that he was obliged to flee. He occupied his enforced leisure in making an appeal throughout Australia for aid for his mission field. In this he was so successful that he was employed later to go to New Zealand and Great Britain on the same errand. The second part of his autobiography contains an animated account of these tours, but more especially of his labors on the island of Aniwa. Here he lived for more than twenty years, with some interruptions, and had the satisfaction of seeing it become completely Christianized. The idols have been burned; churches have been built and schools established; all the institutions, in a word, of a Christian land are maintained, though for some time there has been no resident missionary.

Mr. Paton's style is marked by great simplicity and vivacity, and also by the constant use of Biblical language and metaphors, due to his Scotch training. His book reads like, what it in fact is, a long and enthusiastic missionary address. Though it makes no pretence of giving any special account of the islands and their inhabitants, it is full of graphic pictures of the natives, their manner of life, their superstitions, their oratory, and finally of their simple and childlike obedience to their new faith. The narrative, slightly abridged and in some ways made more attractive to young readers, has been published with a different title, as above.

Laws Regulating the Manufacture and Sale of Intoxicating Liquors. By Henry Campbell Black, M.A. St. Paul: The West Publishing Company.

A more interesting branch of the law to the publicist than the regulation of the liquor traffic, affecting, as it does, the widest range of legal questions—the control of personal habits, the restraint of personal liberty, and the confiscation of private property—it would be difficult to find. The growth of this branch of statute law has been almost wholly within the last ten years, during which period statutes the most diverse in purpose and nature have been enacted in the various States—the rural communities tending to an extremely strict enforcement of high license or local option, and the large cities to extremely lax enforcement of laws continually made more liberal in order to conform to the wishes of a large foreign element accustomed to beer and wine-drinking. No statutes have suffered severer scrutiny than these liquor laws, against which every ingenuity of the pleader has been directed and almost every guarantee of State and national Constitutions invoked, until, as Mr. Black justly says, "a summary of the decisions would almost amount to a commentary on American constitutional jurisprudence." Indeed, the liquor traffic has given rise to some of the most searching discussions of the constitutional power of Congress to regulate inter-State commerce and the scope of the "police power" of the States; and the so-called "License Cases" decided under Taney, and the more recent cases of Bowman vs. the Railway, Leisy vs. Hardin, and Mugler vs. Kansas, are among the most far-reaching and important of the decisions of the Supreme Bench. The effects of the opinion in Leisy vs. Hardin (the "Original-Package Case"), and the subsequent legislation and litigation compelled by it, as revealed by Mr. Black's very careful compilation, make one wonder whether the encroachment of the States upon the Federal prerogative had been or threatened to be so great as to warrant such an apparently unnecessary overthrow of existing law and custom.

The constitutional questions are treated by Mr. Black fully and dispassionately, and are of real value apart from the mere question of the liquor laws. The rest of the book is more useful to the specialist, particularly to prosecuting officers, who cannot fail to be aided by it, though it is to be presumed that the minute marshalling of the wonderful subtleties of the special pleader in behalf of the criminal, which are most instructive as to the stubbornness with which the liquor-dealer has contested every point in existing laws, will give corresponding aid and comfort to the law-breaker. A second edition, if it appears, will no doubt contain the new and interesting decision recently handed down from the Court of Appeals in the case of The People vs. Meakim et al., New York's recalcitrant Excise Commissioners, who seemed certain, under its terms, of going to jail had not the Legislature intervened to save them.

BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

Appleton, Robert. Mr. Philip St. Clare. G. W. Dillingham.
Armatage, George. The Horse: Its Varieties and Management in Health and Disease. F. Warne & Co. $1.
Blackwell, Antoinette B. The Philosophy of Individuality; or, The One and the Many. Putnams. $3.
Crim, Miss Matt Elizabeth, Christian Scientist. C. L. Webster & Co. $1.
Diaz, Mrs. A. M. Only a Flock of Women. Boston: D. Lothrop Co.
Gould, Dr. G. M. The Meaning and the Method of Life: A Search for Religion in Biology. Putnams. $1.75.
Hawthorne, Julian. Six Cent Sam's. St. Paul: Price-McGill Co.
Lysaght, S. R. The Marplot. Macmillan. $1.
Michie, Prof. P. S., and Harlow, Lieut. F. S. Practical Astronomy. John Wiley & Sons. $3.
Norman, Henry. The Real Japan. 3d ed. Scribners. $1.50.
Owen, Mary A. Voodoo Tales as Told among the Negroes of the Southwest. Putnams. $1.75.
Twenty-two Years' Work of the Hampton Normal and Agricultural Institute; Records of Negro and Indian Graduates and Ex-Students. Hampton, Va.: Normal School Press. $1.
Wheatley, H. B. The Diary of Samuel Pepys. Vol. I. London: George Bell & Sons; New York: Macmillan. $1.50.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED